

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 1.—JANUARY, 1904.

I.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM: POSITIVE AND CONSTRUCTIVE.

BY PROF. F. A. GAST, D.D.

The Pentateuch, according to modern criticism, is of composite structure. Its material is drawn from four main sources, usually designated J, E, D and P. These sources have marked characteristics of thought, language and style, by which for the most part they can readily be distinguished one from another. The compiler of the Pentateuch did not, like a historian of to-day, after a careful comparative study of his sources work out the story for himself and then tell it in his own words; but, like the old chroniclers, he made verbatim extracts, longer or shorter, now from this document, now from that, as seemed to him best, and without recasting his material, worked it up into the form of a continuous narrative. It is this fact that has made it possible for the critics, by an accurate analysis of the Pentateuch, to resolve it into the several sources from which it was compiled, and so, by recombining the material of each source, to reproduce the original documents lying back of the whole book. Of course, a document thus reconstructed from fragmentary extracts would necessarily be more or less incomplete. The compiler might

find the story of an event given in one form in one of his sources, and in a different or even contradictory form in another. He might wish to retain both forms of the story, as, for example, the two accounts of creation, or he might displace the story as related, say, by J, and insert it as related by E, thus creating a gap in J. Yet in spite of these unavoidable breaks the several documents have been so far reconstituted that we can easily and clearly discern their peculiar points of view, their modes of religious thought and their animating spirit.

Criticism, however, has not confined itself to the Pentateuch. Its task is not finished when it has traced out the process by which the five first books of the Old Testament gradually grew into their present form and extent. By the application of the scientific historical method it has discovered that the other historical books, if we except Ruth and Esther, are likewise compiled from earlier and later sources which the editor has generally used with little alteration. The Book of Joshua, in fact, stands on the same plane with the Pentateuch. As they belong together, they are now commonly named the Hexateuch. The former is the natural continuation of the latter, inasmuch as it records the conquest and division of the Promised Land, to which from the beginning the Pentateuch looks forward as the goal. Whether Joshua was always an independent work separate from the Pentateuch, or whether both originally formed a single whole from which Joshua was cut off at a later time, it is demonstrable that precisely the same sources furnished the material from which both were composed. In other books the case is somewhat different. The use of documentary sources is clearly manifest, but the process of combining them is, in general, less complicated than in the Hexateuch.

The prophetic books, also, have been, and still are, subjected to the closest scrutiny. We are wont to think of them as having been written throughout, each by the prophet whose name it bears. This, as regards several of them at least, is

found on examination to be a mistake. In the Book of Isaiah, for example, a critical eye at once detects such differences in language and style, in the historical situation implied and the religious ideas expressed, as can be naturally and satisfactorily explained only on the supposition of several authors, writing at different times and in different circumstances. The conclusion reached by a large majority of professional Old Testament scholars is that the only genuine discourses of Isaiah that have come down to us are confined within the limits of chapters 1-35, where, moreover, they are surrounded by non-Isaian discourses of a later, sometimes much later date, than the age of Ahaz and Hezekiah; while chapters 40-66 are assigned to a time not earlier than the later years of the Exile, and in part, by a growing number of critics to-day, to the period after the Exile. And what is held to be true of this book is regarded as equally true of other prophetic books—Jeremiah, Micah, Zechariah—that severally they are not the exclusive work of the prophets to whom their authorship is traditionally ascribed, but contain also discourses by other, unnamed prophets.

Now, such an analysis of the Hexateuch and other historical books of the Old Testament for the purpose of discovering the sources from which they were compiled, and such a resolution of prophetic books into discourses written by different authors, yet united in one book bearing the name of an individual prophet, may seem strange, may even be startling. And some plain reader, who has found in the Old Testament as well as in the New a lamp to his feet and a light to his path, may well ask: "What is the good of it all—this rending of the literary unity of Biblical books into ill-assorted fragments? Did not our fathers feel, has not the Christian Church in all ages felt, in the Bible the presence of the living Word-of-God, and experienced the life-giving power of that Word"? We answer, Yes; and we thank God that for the highest, the religious, use of the Bible, human learning is not indispensable. The Bible is not a text-book of metaphysical theology which

only a trained philosophic mind could comprehend, nor yet a treasury of general knowledge which man may discover by his own reason. It is a book of religion, not of the science of religion. It is the medium of communication between God and the human soul. Through it man comes into the immediate presence of God and hears His voice speaking directly to his heart in some precious promise, some sweet word of consolation, some needed injunction, some solemn warning. Its testimony to God's awful hatred of sin, His tender forgiving love, His constant guardian care, comes with irresistible, self-evidencing power, not primarily to the intellectual, but rather to the moral and spiritual nature, of the unlearned as well as the learned, of the simple as well as the wise.

Such a use of the Bible as this, which brings us face to face with God, is practical and devotional; and it is the noblest use to which this noblest of all books can be put. "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work" (2 Tim. 3:16, 17, R. V.). In it God speaks the word suitable to every spiritual need of man. Not, indeed, with equal clearness and power in all portions. The table of nations in Gen. ch. 10, the genealogies in 1 Chron. chs. 1-9, the minute ritual prescriptions in the Book of Leviticus minister little to spiritual edification, as compared with other parts of the Old Testament, such as Psalms 51, 103, 91 and 23. Devotional reading is, for the most part, eclectic. It passes lightly over what is difficult or obscure to fasten upon some word which thrills the heart as a message direct from heaven and fitted to our present state, whether of penitential grief, or of gratitude for Divine goodness, or of deep longing for communion with God. What is needed, if we are to derive spiritual profit from the Word of God, is not the learning acquired in the schools of earth, but a childlike mind, a reverent spirit, an open ear listening to hear the divine Voice.

And in this respect the critic, with all his intellectual training, has no advantage over the simple uneducated peasant. Both stand on the same level. In his hours of devotion, when he comes to meet his God, the Christian critic is not disturbed by difficulties inherent in the letter of the Bible. He is in communication with the divine Spirit conveyed through the imperfect human medium of the letter. "The letter," he is aware, "killeth, but the spirit giveth life" (2 Cor. 3: 6). In such moments, when the Spirit touches his spirit and lifts him above the world, the composite nature of many books, the union of discourses by different prophets in one book, the numerous discrepancies in the historical narratives—these, with other matters pertaining to the literary history of the Old Testament, utterly vanish from his mind. He hears only God speaking to his heart, it matters not through what human author, at what time that author lived, or in what circumstances he wrote. In the presence of his God such questions fade into insignificance, and he goes out of his closet with a firmer faith, a brighter hope, a nobler courage, a truer consecration to God, and a more self-sacrificing love to man.

Cornill is one of the most radical as well as one of the ablest of the German Old Testament critics; yet he is a devout Christian, a faithful member of the Reformed Church, and deeply interested and active in the advancement of the Kingdom of God. Let us hear his confession concerning a book too often regarded as a silly tale worthy only of a derisive smile. "I have read the Book of Jonah at least a hundred times, and I will publicly avow, for I am not ashamed of my weakness, that I cannot even now take up this marvellous book, nay, nor even speak of it, without the tears rising to my eyes, and my heart beating higher. This apparently trivial book is one of the deepest and grandest that was ever written, and I should like to say to every one who approaches it, 'Take off thy shoes, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground!'" And he adds: "More simply, as something quite self-evident, and therefore more sublimely and touchingly, the truth was never

spoken in the Old Testament, that God, as Creator of the whole earth, must also be the God and Father of the entire world, in whose loving, kind and fatherly heart all men are equal, before whom there is no difference of nation and confession, but only men, whom He has created in His own image." "In the celestial harmony of the infinite godly love and of the infinite godly pity, the Israelitic prophecy rings out as the most costly bequest of Israel to the whole world." *

A similar incident, communicated to the present writer by Dr. Schaff, which has probably never before appeared in print, may not be amiss. It relates to Wellhausen, than whom, perhaps, no other Old Testament critic has met with such bitter denunciation on account of the supposed negative and destructive character of his criticism, though, in fact, he has laid the only sure foundation for a positive and constructive criticism. One day a colleague encountered him, as he was leaving the university before his hour had expired, and kindly inquired whether he was ill. "No," said Wellhausen; "but, you see, I was expounding the seventy-third Psalm; and whenever I read the words: 'Whom have I in heaven but Thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire beside Thee,' I must weep; and so, not wishing my students to see me shedding tears, I dismissed the class." It would seem, then, that a higher critic has not only a head that can deal with scientific and historical facts, but also a heart that can be powerfully moved by spiritual and religious truths.

It ought to be evident to every thinking mind that the devotional use of the Old Testament does not preclude the scientific study of its historical origin and growth. The two ways of dealing with the Bible are different and far apart. In the one we have to do with its divine side, with the sole purpose of spiritual edification; in the other we confine our investigations exclusively to its human side, to discover if possible, how in the course of history the Old Testament grew to be what it is. The one has interest chiefly for the heart, the conscience,

* Cornill, "The Prophets of Israel," Eng. transl., pp. 170, 173.

the higher life of the soul; the other is rather for the intellect searching for an answer to important literary and historical questions. In the quiet hour of meditation and devotion, when we long for some message from God suited to our present spiritual needs, we do not find the Old Testament equally inspiring and profitable in all its parts, but we select such books, or portions of books, as most readily lend themselves to immediate practical use. A truly scientific historical study of the Bible, however, must cover its entire extent. Nothing, not even genealogies or lists of royal officers, is so insignificant that it may be safely passed without notice. Apparent trifles are often of the highest value.

The Bible is at once divine and human. It is a message from heaven, yet a message communicated through the mind of man in the language of earth. The divine truth it conveys authenticates itself immediately to a spiritual mind and finds a response in spiritual experience. It is meant for every human soul, and may be apprehended as easily by the simplest peasant as by the most learned sage. And it may be, accordingly, that some one may say, "If that be true, what need we more"? We answer: Much every way; for the Bible is the word of man as well as the Word of God; and as the word of man, it must, like every other body of literature, be subjected to a rigid scientific examination. Nothing can be fully understood until we have traced it from its genesis through the various stages of its formation up to its final completion. This is no less true of the Bible than of any other object of knowledge. What we especially need to know of it, considered as the word of man, is, how it came into historical existence in its present form. To discover this by the scientific method of investigation is the special task of the higher criticism. It is a difficult task, for which not every one is qualified. All may, indeed, if they will, even though wholly unacquainted with critical science, derive from the Bible the sustenance necessary for the higher life of the soul; just as all, by partaking of good wholesome food, maintain the life

of the body, however ignorant they may be of the chemical constituents of food, or of the physiological processes by which it is converted into flesh and blood. But would it not be folly to say that, because we derive immediate good from our food, whether spiritual or material, there is no need for the science of biblical criticism, on the one hand, or of chemistry or physiology, on the other?

It is generally admitted, however, that biblical criticism is necessary, provided it be of the right kind; but not the higher criticism of to-day, which is ignorantly accused of being merely divisive and destructive, of dismembering the Old Testament in a merciless way, and arbitrarily putting asunder what God has joined together. And we must acknowledge that at first sight it has this appearance. Thus, for example, it separates the beginning of Genesis—the account of creation (ch. 1-2: 4^a), from what follows on to the close of chapter 4, and assigns to the former section a date between three and four centuries later than the date of the latter section. This has, indeed, a destructive look. It at least breaks up the literary unity of many books which were long held to have been written each by a single author.

What can the "divisive critic," as he is often reproachfully called, say in reply to this seemingly serious charge? He claims to have discovered, by applying the same scientific method to the Old Testament as to any other literature, infallible indications that in many of its books earlier and later sources lie confusedly side by side, rendering it impossible from their present chronologically disordered form to trace the historical development of the religious thought and life of Israel. He claims, moreover, that by a careful analysis of such composite books, criticism has recovered their original documentary sources, determined approximately but with sufficient accuracy, the date of those sources, and rearranged them in the order in which they were written. He believes that in this way he has found the key to the literary history of the Old Testament.

The Old Testament itself incurs no loss from a truly scientific criticism. On the contrary, regarded on its human side and as an historical production, it gains immensely. And what it gains more than compensates for the destruction of traditional conceptions, however cherished, and for the temporary pain caused by the transition from old views to new. The higher criticism, when true to its method, puts it in our power to bring harmonious order out of the historical confusion which results from the commingling of material borrowed from sources often far apart in time. It places in our hands the key to a satisfactory explanation of numerous perplexing discrepancies, by referring the inconsistent or contradictory statements to different writers, living at different periods and occupying different points of view. Above all, it elevates us to a position from which we can discern the living organic unity of the Old Testament amid its endless diversity. And this it does by separating from the complex whole the material derived from each several source; recombining the material peculiar to each; and then arranging the several recombinations in chronological order. For every piece of literature, whether narrative, poem, legal code, or whatsoever, is the outgrowth of a particular age, and reflects the life, the spirit, the ideas of that age. So that if we study in succession the sources belonging to the several periods of a nation's history, we shall be able to mark its growth in civilization, its advancement in science and art, its progress in religious truth and moral life, the changes in old institutions and the rise of new, in short, its development through all the stages of its existence.

Let it no longer be said that the higher criticism is merely negative and destructive, because it analyses the books of the Old Testament into their constituent parts, and assigns them to the periods, earlier or later, in which they originated. The truth is just the reverse. Analysis is not an end in itself, but only a means. Analysis is in order to a new and better synthesis. At most it is only the outward form of the Bible that is affected, not any part of its contents. The higher criticism

does not aim to give us an expurgated edition. It may indeed say of certain portions of the Book of Isaiah that they do not belong to the genuine discourses of that prophet, but were written in the exilic or post-exilic age. But it does not say that they are spurious and unwarranted additions to the ancient Scriptures, and are to be violently thrust out. It retains all that it finds in the Canonical books of the Old Testament; only it gives to much a different historical setting. But this new setting cannot, in the least degree, destroy the inspiration of any part. Nothing whatever is lost. And what moves us so powerfully now in its present unhistorical position, will move us no less powerfully when known to belong to another stage of Biblical history. What is divinely true in Scripture is independent of questions of human authorship or date of composition.

The fact is that the criticism of to-day is nothing, if not positive and constructive. Prior to the last three decades, indeed, criticism occupied itself chiefly with discovering and marking off the literary sources of the Hexateuch. That work was indispensable to the fulfilment of its proper task, and has consequently lost nothing of its value. But the older criticism did not appreciate the importance of its results, and so failed to make full use of them for the reconstruction of the history of Israel, especially the history of the religion of Israel. It was necessary to take a step forward. The literary critic had to become a critical historian. Having after long and careful investigation recovered the documentary sources of the Old Testament, it falls to him now to trace the development of the religious beliefs, the worship and the moral life of Israel. For a quarter of a century he has been engaged on this task. Let us see with what success.

When we ask, what conception did Israel have of Jahveh and his relation to man, we find that the traditional answer differs widely from that given by criticism. The common opinion is that Jahveh was at all times believed, if not indeed by the populace, yet by the representative minds in Israel, to

be the one, only true God, excluding all other gods as figments of the imagination—the Creator of heaven and earth—invisible to mortal eyes, spiritual in nature, ethical in character, revealing himself to his people through Moses and the prophets—transcending the world, dwelling in heaven, yet exercising universal dominion over nature and history—a righteous governor, making all things subserve the interests of his chosen people—absolutely unique, exalted in holiness above all created being, as well as all moral evil—inaccessible except at one sanctuary, through a graded priesthood and an elaborate ritual.

Such was the conception of Jahveh prevalent at the close of Israel's religious development. Did it exist in its completeness already at the very beginning? Did it undergo no purifying and spiritualizing process, no advance from lower and cruder ideas to higher and more refined? Was it always the same from the days of Moses throughout the centuries? So the traditional theory, based on the Priests' Code, holds. It was all given by Moses—the Law and this conception of Jahveh implied by the Law. The prophets had only to expound and apply it to the needs of the people, who, in general, could not rise to the height of so spiritual an idea of their God and remained on a low level of the religious life. From Moses onward throughout the whole preëxilic period, Israel evinced an almost unconquerable tendency to lapse from the higher and purer religion instituted by the founder, into the heathenism of the surrounding nations, or, at least, to mingle heathen elements with the worship divinely prescribed by the Law. It was a tendency that not even the long, earnest, strenuous efforts of the prophets could wholly overcome. Its complete eradication required nothing less than the drastic measure of the Exile. Yet in spite of the ignorance of the people generally, the Old Testament religion with its ethical monotheism was complete from the beginning, and never failed, even in the pre-prophetic age, to find worthy exponents in such noble minds, as Samuel, David and Elijah.

This is the traditional answer to the question, How did Israel conceive of Jahveh. And it would seem as if the first chapter of the Book of Genesis proves its correctness. The God who in the beginning created the heavens and the earth is a truly spiritual God. The representation of his creative activity is free from all mythological ideas. Anthropomorphisms are singularly absent. He does not appear in visible outward form, or fashion the universe in a mechanical way. He simply speaks and the world comes into being. His mere Word is an omnipotent power. Nothing can exceed the sublimity of his effective utterance: "Let there be light"; with the following response: "And there was light." He himself is concealed from our gaze; we only hear his voice, as creation unfolds itself to our view in successive stages from lower to higher, till it reaches its crown in man, made in the image of God and endowed with dominion over the world.

But now, when we pass beyond the fourth verse of the second chapter, we at once enter a different world of religious thought. The God we meet in this second section (2: 5-3: 24) is not the same God as in the first section. He is a very human God—human in form and action, in needs and passions. His home is on the earth. He takes his evening walk in the cool of the day. He appears visibly to Adam and his wife, and holds conversation with them, as a man with men. Like a human sculptor, he first fashions man out of the dust of the ground, and then breathes into his nostrils the breath of life. When the man needs a suitable companion, he takes a rib from Adam's side and out of it makes a woman, closing up the rent with flesh. Later he makes coats of skins to clothe the nakedness of the fallen pair. His knowledge is limited. When the man and the woman hide themselves in guilty fear behind the trees, he must inquire where they are. He even experiments in creating, and forms the animals to see, whether among them all there can be found a helpmeet for the man. Strangely enough, he fears that, because man has come to know good and evil, he may become altogether too

godlike, and by eating of the fruit of the tree of life may attain to immortality; so in jealousy of his rights he thrusts him out of the garden. Such a conception is crudely anthropomorphic and anthropopathic. It cannot be made to harmonize with the lofty conception given immediately before. Or will it be said that the language of the first section is literal, while that of the second section is figurative or symbolical, and is to be interpreted allegorically? Such a suggestion would never arise, if the two representations were met, side by side, elsewhere than in the Bible. It is made only to escape a difficulty created by language so perilously like the language of classical mythology.

And now, what has the higher criticism to say? It tells us that the purer conception of God, with which the Book of Genesis opens, belongs to the very latest of the Hexateuchal documents—the Priests' Code, designated by the letter P, whereas the gross anthropomorphic conception belongs to the earliest document, the Jahvistic, designated by the letter J; and that between them there is a wide interval of not less than four centuries. If this be true, we need no longer feel surprise at these broadly divergent representations of God. For religious knowledge, like all other knowledge, grows with time, advancing from lower to higher, from coarser to more refined ideas. And what progress would be made in the course of the four hundred years during which all the great prophets of Israel, before and after the exile, lived and taught.

From this one instance we may see how the higher critic proceeds in his constructive work. After having by analysis discovered the literary sources from which the material of the Old Testament is drawn, and assigned those sources to the several periods to which they belong, he is in a position to study them successively in the order of time, marking every change in religious belief and the gradual progress of religious truth. Such is his historical method, which, rightly employed, will enable him, if there be no lack of literary sources at any stage, to sketch the entire development of the religion

of Israel from its origin to its close. And this is the task on which the Old Testament theologian, working on the basis of the higher criticism, is now more especially engaged. All else is secondary, and subservient to this. Space will allow us at this time, however, only to touch very lightly on a few points relating to the development of the conception of Jahveh and his relation to Israel.

Jahveh is the God of Israel, and Him alone may his people serve. That is the fundamental truth underlying the religion of Israel. It finds expression everywhere in the Old Testament, but is differently understood in the several periods.

In the preprophetic period, prior to the eighth century B. C., Jahveh was not yet known and recognized as the supreme, universal, spiritual Being, unique in kind, the one only God of heaven and earth. He is only one among many, though superior to all others. "Who is like unto Thee, O Jahveh, among the gods?" (Ex. 15:11). It was the ancient belief that every people had its god. Moah had its Chemosh, as Israel its Jahveh. And these gods of the nations were held to be as real, though not as powerful, as Jahveh himself. This idea was shared by all alike, by the most prominent and enlightened representatives of Israel, as well as by the common ignorant masses. Jephthah recognizes the real existence of Chemosh (Jud. 11:24); Joash, Gideon's father, throws down the altar of Baal (Jud. 6:31); and David acknowledges that outside of Canaan other gods are to be worshiped (1 Sam. 26:19). In early Israel theoretical polytheism,—the belief in many gods—was united with practical monotheism,—monolatry, the worship of one god. As the God of Israel, Jahveh could be rightly worshiped only in his heritage, the land of Israel. Beyond its borders, his worshiper came under the power of other gods to whom he must pay homage. David reproached Saul for driving him out of Israel, thus compelling him to serve other gods; and his prayer is that his blood may not fall to the earth in a foreign land away from the presence of Jahveh (1 Sam. 26:19, 20). Indeed, so closely are the

god and his land connected that Naaman, after being healed from leprosy by the prophet Elisha, and wishing to worship Jahveh in his native land, carries some of the sacred soil of Israel to Syria, that he may erect on it an altar to Jahveh; and he does this with the sanction of Elisha (2 Kg. 5:17, 19).

Jahveh is not a personification of the forces of nature, nor yet God in the Christian sense of that word. He was regarded as a superhuman personality, indeed, but as thinking, feeling and willing according to the analogy of man. In the earliest sources from which the material of the document J has been drawn he appears in outward visible form. So he presented himself, unrecognized at first, before Abraham, and even partook of the bountiful meal provided by the hospitable patriarch (Gen. 18:1-8, 22). But in the somewhat later document E, he withdraws from human gaze and reveals himself usually by a voice, often that of an angelic messenger (Gen. 21:17), or by a dream (Gen. 20; 3; 31:11). The idea of omnipresence is wanting in this early period. Jahveh's home is at first on earth, but he is not equally present in all places. His original seat was on Sinai or Horeb (Jud. 5:4; Deut. 33:2), whither even Elijah went to seek him (1 Kg. 19:4-18). In general, he is regarded as dwelling in the sanctuaries of the land of Canaan, which as late as the prophetic age is still called the land or house of Jahveh (Hos. 8:1; 9:3, 15). As superhuman, Jahveh greatly transcends man in knowledge and power. Special emphasis is laid on his power, because he is a being to be feared. But neither his knowledge nor his power is unlimited. When an evil report comes to him about Sodom and Gomorrah, he goes to those cities to ascertain for himself whether it is true or false. Nevertheless he discerns the secret thoughts of Sarah's heart when she laughs within herself, and reveals by the oracle the hidden things of the past, the present and the future. So, too, his power greatly exceeds the power of man. Whatever is grand and mysterious in nature and history is ascribed to him. Earthquakes, famine, pestilence, the overthrow of cities are

wrought by his immediate agency. Nothing is too hard for Jahveh (Gen. 18:14), and there is no restraint to him to save by many or by few (1 Sam. 14:6). Still, the conception of the world, as known to early Israel, was too narrow to suggest the metaphysical idea of omnipotence.

Jahveh is the mighty ruler of Israel who cannot on account of his holiness, be approached with impunity without previous ceremonial preparation. His holiness, however, is not conceived of at this early time as an ethical attribute. It is the uniqueness of his being, separating and keeping him aloof from all other existences by a limit which no man may overstep; it is his essential majesty, which he jealously guards. For merely putting forth his hand to hold up the tottering ark of God, which as Jahveh's dwelling-place was holy, Uzzah was smitten dead (2 Sam. 6:6). Jahveh's anger is easily aroused, and the reason is not always apparent. Once he sought to kill Moses; why, we are not told (Ex. 4:24-26). He is even represented as enticing and deceiving men. He sent among the prophets of Ahab a lying spirit, so that by their false prophecies they might occasion the death of the King (1 Kg. 22:19, 23). He sent an evil spirit of discord between the Shechemites and Abimelech for their mutual destruction (Jud. 9:23). Compare the madness of Saul (1 Sam. 16:14; 18:10; 19:9). He incites David to number the people, for which he afterwards punishes him (2 Sam. 24). The God with whom the early Israelite held intercourse was a mysterious Being, of variable moods, whose manifestations are not to be judged by ordinary moral standards. And yet features are not wholly wanting, on the basis of which the prophets at a later time transformed the idea of God from the holy one in a physical sense to the holy one in an ethical sense. As the God of Israel he punishes any member of his people who violates an oath or sheds innocent blood. He gives Israel his land on account of the wickedness of its former inhabitants; and for the same reason he rains fire and brimstone on Sodom and Gomorrah. But Jahveh is a faithful God, ful-

filling every promise to his people and delivering them out of every danger. He "is a man of war" (Ex. 15:3), "the God of the armies of Israel" (1 Sam. 17:45). It was the ancient belief, which finds expression already in the song of Deborah (Jud. 5:4, 23), that Jahveh went out with his people to battle and gave them victory over their foes (Jud. 7:18, 20). On this belief rests the early custom of taking the ark of Jahveh, in which he was supposed to dwell, with the host of Israel when it marched forth to battle (1 Sam. 4:3-8). But these gracious manifestations of Israel's God were confined to Israel. Toward his and his people's enemies he displayed a merciless fury.

Such is the Jahveh of early Israel before the appearance of the literary prophets. Doubtless during this long period of at least five centuries from Moses to Amos, there were individual minds that attained to higher and purer conceptions on certain points. But they have left us no records. It is clear, however, that the earliest documents underlying our present Hexateuch, Judges and Samuel, embody differing views, some very primitive, others betraying a later age, yet all conforming to the same general type. And in this we have proof of progress in religious knowledge.

If, now, we pass to the books of the prophets from the eighth century onward, and to those sections of the historical books that date from the prophetic period, we shall find Jahveh presented in an altogether new, loftier and worthier light. The old conception is still cherished by the masses of the people, the new first appears in the discourses of Amos (about 750 B. C., or a few years earlier). The difference between them is very broad. We cannot suppose, however, that the Jahveh of the prophets is a sudden creation of Amos. He makes no such claim; quite the reverse. We cannot but believe that the prophetic conception of the God of Israel is the outcome of a progressive revelation through divinely chosen minds, though we can no longer accurately trace its historical growth.

The proposition: Jahveh is the God of Israel, still is for

the prophets the fundamental truth of their religion, but it receives from them a new interpretation and a higher meaning. Jahveh is no longer one god among other equally real national gods. He is the only God, and beside him there is no other. Ethical monotheism has displaced the earlier henotheism. This lies implicitly already in Amos' spiritual conception of Jahveh, whether or not he was clearly conscious of all it involved. Jeremiah and Deuteronomy are the first to teach positively and explicitly the unreality of the other gods. Hosea and Isaiah repeatedly call the images of God *elilim*, things of naught, but these *elilim* are the images Israel has made for itself. Jeremiah goes beyond this and says that the Gentiles themselves will at last confess that their gods are "lies, vanities, wherein is no profit" (Jer. 16:19, 20). So, too, Deuteronomy identifies the strange gods and their images, "the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell" (Deut. 4:27, 28). Towards the close of the Exile, the Deutero-Isaiah, time and again, ridicules the worship of other gods than Jahveh (Is. 40:18-20; 44:9-20; 40:5-7). And so, through the teachings of the prophets, belief in the one only God, accompanied with a theoretical denial of the reality of all other gods, became gradually and unalterably fixed even in the popular mind.

Jahveh, indeed, continues to be the God of Israel, holding a closer relation to that people than to any other; yet in this period he has become more than the god of a clan or tribe or even of a nation. The national God has become the God of the world (Deut. 4:39). As he brought Israel from Egypt, so he brought the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir. He uses the heathen peoples as well as Israel to accomplish his purposes. The Assyrian is the rod of his anger (Is. 10:5). The Egyptians, the Chaldeans, the Medes and Persians are his unconscious agents, and play their part in history under his wise direction. And the prophets foresee a time when the particularism characteristic of the old religion shall give way to religious universalism, and the God of Israel shall become the God of all nations.

This presupposes the spiritual nature of Jahveh. In the pre-prophetic age the emphasis laid upon his personality tended to obscure his spirituality and made the representation of him to be at times grossly anthropomorphic. He partakes of human food; he smells the sweet savour of the sacrifices; he shuts Noah in the ark; he writes the ten commandments with his finger on two tables of stone. Very different are the terms in which from the eighth century prophets and psalmists speak of him. With advancing religious knowledge, they eliminate from their conception of Jahveh the crude elements inherent in the conception found in early Israel and exalt him above all that is earthly and human. He is God and not man (Hos. 11: 9); he neither slumbers nor sleeps (Ps. 121: 4); he is the everlasting God, the creator of the ends of the earth, who fainteth not, neither is weary, and of whose understanding there is no searching (Is. 40: 28). In the dedicatory prayer ascribed to Solomon, but which in its present form is of much later date, the King asks: "But will God indeed dwell on the earth?" And he himself gives the answer: "Behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded" (1 Kg. 8: 27). The author of Psalm 139 rises to the thought of God's omniscience and omnipresence; and what a grand expression of the spirituality of Israel's God we have in the words: "Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him, also, that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones" (Is. 57: 15).

Jahveh is the God of Israel: that was never doubted. But what was the bond of union? Was it natural, or moral? On this question the prophets came into collision with the popular conception. In the early age, and by the mass of the nation prior to the exile, it was thought that in the nature of things Jahveh and Israel belong together. As a matter of course, every god must have his people, and every people its

god. The overthrow of a nation would be the dethronement of its god. Israel's land was the heritage of Jahveh. There his altars were erected and his sacrifices offered. He was Israel's natural protector, and what he demanded in return for his favor was numerous offerings and a rich and splendid ceremonial. When the nation faithfully rendered this outward service, it felt sure of his help in every time of need. Worship and morality were things apart.

But the prophets viewed the relation between Jahveh and his people in a different light. They spiritualized the idea of God and ascribed to him a truly moral character. They discovered in the world a moral order established by Jahveh, in the interest of which he governs the whole universe. What he requires is not sacrifice and offering. With what scorn he rejects them, if unaccompanied by a righteous life, we read in the prophet Amos: "I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me burnt offerings and your meat offerings, I will not accept them, neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. Take away from me the noise of thy songs, for I will not hear the melody of thy viols" (Amos 5: 21-24; comp. Is. 1: 11-15). What he requires is moral good. Says Amos: "Seek good, and not evil, that ye may live"; "let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream" (5: 14, 15, 24; comp. Is. 1: 16, 17; Mic. 6: 6-9).

From the Jahveh of early Israel to the Jahveh of the prophets there was a marvelous advance. How can it be accounted for? No other Semitic people attained to this ethical monotheistic conception of God. Every other Semitic religion developed a crude and immoral polytheism. As Israel stands alone among the ancient nations in this, as in so many other respects, there must have been something in the character of Israel's religion from its very birth, which differentiated it from the religions of the other peoples. And that must be sought in its fundamental principle, that Jahveh is Israel's only God, and his worship excludes the worship of every other

god. This principle saved Israel from sinking into polytheism, to which it was naturally inclined, and made it possible, through the influence of divinely inspired minds, gradually to develop a religion of such a spiritual and ethical nature.

There remains to be considered the critical, in contrast to the traditional theory of the history of worship as developed in the Old Testament; but not to prolong this article unduly, we reserve the subject for a later time.

II.

CONCORD: HER ANCIENT GLORY AND ABIDING CHARM.*

BY C. ERNEST WAGNER.

It was on a rare morning in July, fresh and pure after three days of rain, with the wind coming steadily from the northwest and the snowy clouds trooping in stately file across the sky, that I found myself longing for the gift of a Goldsmith, to sing the charm of Concord, "loveliest village of the plain." For so, in her radiant beauty, this new England town impressed me. As I walked her muffled, sandy streets, arched by aged elms and lined with cottage homes, as I watched the sunlight filtering through the leaves upon the softest of green swards, and, looking through the open spaces, caught now and again a glimpse of meadow, stream and tree-crowned upland, enchantingly bright and beautiful, I communed with myself, saying: "The clouds are the clouds of Somerset; the meadows are the meadows of Oxford; but the elms and cottages are the inalienable birthright of our own New England." So exceptional were the conditions, so pleasurable the sensations, and so vivid the impressions that I could not help censuring the strange inertia which had permitted me to live so long in ignorance of the marvelous physical charm of this otherwise famous town. Inspired by the revelation of beauty then vouchsafed, I shall try to communicate to those who have not yet been moved to a like experience the knowledge gained and the impressions received during a fortnight's sojourn in old Concord.

* For many matters of fact and detail I am indebted to the following publications: "Concord: Some of the Things to be Seen There," by George Tolman; "The Concord Guide Book: Historic, Literary, and Picturesque Concord," by George B. Bartlett.

As things go in America the town may well be called old; for it was in 1635 that the General Court of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay established a plantation at Musketaquid to consist of a tract six miles square. Musketaquid, meaning the grass ground or meadows, had been the site of an Indian village, wisely located at the junction of two rivers, now the Assabet and Sudbury, which here unite to form the Concord. These rivers, full of fish, flowed through a broad alluvial plain, almost entirely cleared of wood, although the low hills that surrounded it were well-wooded and accessible. The meadows, being the largest expanse of clear and tillable ground that had yet been found in the limits of the colony, naturally attracted the attention of the early settlers. Under the leadership of the Rev. Peter Bulkeley, an English clergyman who, for non-conformity, had been deprived by Archbishop Laud of his living, the land for the new settlement was bought from its Indian owners. The story of this transaction is best told by a bronze tablet set in a stone wall on Lowell Street, near the village square:

HERE IN THE HOUSE OF THE
REVEREND PETER BULKELEY
FIRST MINISTER AND ONE OF THE
FOUNDERS OF THIS TOWN
A BARGAIN WAS MADE WITH THE
SQUAW SACHEM THE SAGAMORE TAHATTAWAN
AND OTHER INDIANS
WHO THEN SOLD THE RIGHT IN
THE SIX MILES SQUARE CALLED CONCORD
TO THE ENGLISH PLANTERS
AND GAVE THEM PEACEFUL POSSESSION
OF THE LAND.
A. D. 1636.

The squaw sachem referred to above seems to have been a woman of great power in her tribe, and it may not be unwarranted to assume that the peaceable settlement was, in some degree at least, owing to this feminine influence. The first owners were evidently well satisfied with their bargain; for

in all the Indian wars which followed Concord was almost the only town in the entire colony that never suffered from an Indian raid upon her territory. It is commonly believed that this peaceful mode of settling the Indian question gave to the town the name of Concord, a place name unknown, it is said, until that time.

Of the subsequent history of Concord—her well-known distinction in Revolutionary times; her prominence in the anti-slavery agitation; the fame of her School of Philosophy; her activity in statecraft, jurisprudence, journalism, and pamphleteering (not to speak of the undimmed glory of her pure literature); her eminence in art and philanthropy, ay, even in horticulture (witness the Concord Grape!)—of this brilliant record it may well be said, the history of Concord has been the history of her great men and women. And so, in our ramble about the historic town, as the names and places suggest in turn facts and events, I shall let the story, in this natural and perforce somewhat inconsequential fashion, tell itself.

Monument Square, which is, by the way, the exact geographical centre of the original six miles square, is the proper starting point for our tour of observation. In its centre, on a grass-grown plot, stands the Soldiers' Monument, an obelisk of New England granite, erected in 1867, and bearing on one side of its base the names of the forty-two sons of Concord who perished in the War of Secession. Near it is the town elm, a noble tree of enormous girth and reach of bough, which, according to tradition, was already of fair proportions in Revolutionary times. Under its branches, it is said, the Rev. William Emerson, grandfather of the poet, delivered his famous speech on the morning of the Concord Fight (April 19, 1775). Behind the old elm, and touched by its wide-spreading boughs, is the Town Hall, where Emerson delivered many of the lectures which, when given to the world, went far to establish the eternity of his fame. A bronze tablet, on the opposite side of the square, marks the site of the old

Town Hall, from the turret of which rang out the bell that called the farmers to arms on that memorable April morning. The vane that swung above it for a century and a half, with the date 1673 carved upon it, is now preserved in the Public Library. At the northwest end of the square stands the Colonial Hotel, a low, rambling structure, made up of several ancient buildings, one of which was used in the early spring of 1775 as a storehouse for the arms, provisions, and other war material that the patriots had been collecting during the preceding winter. At the opposite end of the square still stands intact the old Wrights' Tavern, built in 1747, the headquarters of the patriots in the early morning of April 19, 1775, and later in the day occupied by the British officers. It was here that Major Pitcairn made his famous boast, as he stirred his morning dram, that before the day was over he would stir the damned Yankee blood as well. The tavern is still a public house; but the day of drams and damns has passed away; for Concord is now a Prohibition town, and profanity, if still existent, is no longer blatant and unrebuked within her borders.

In an open space just back of the tavern, and a little off of the square, rises the First Parish Meeting House, a handsome edifice built in 1901 to replace the original structure that had been destroyed by fire in the year 1900. The old building, erected in 1702, was the meeting place of the first Provincial Congress in October, 1774, a fact commemorated by a tablet directly in front of the church, on the edge of the green. It is interesting to recall that Daniel Bliss, the great-grandfather, William Emerson, the grandfather, and Ezra Ripley, the step-grandfather of Ralph Waldo Emerson, were successively the ministers of this parish, and that the greatest of the Emersons himself occasionally preached from its pulpit.

The present congregation have shown rare good taste in the rehabilitation of their meeting house. They have not only reproduced with great fidelity the *tout ensemble* of the

former structure, but in the matter of interior furnishing and decoration they have achieved an effect of singular brightness and simplicity. The dim and sombre are banished, and in their stead there is a blaze of white and gold. The pastor, too—a thoroughgoing Emersonian—is a consistent preacher of the gospel of joy and gladness. Blessed with high health and abounding physical strength, broad of brow and deep of chest, he comes to the pulpit after a Saturday given to canoeing and golf with a brain free from cobwebs and distorting mists. In the Concord of to-day—most of all in the First Meeting House—one may be tempted to wonder whether the Puritan any longer exists; and if allowed to judge by the stress laid upon all that is distinctly un-Puritan, and by the undisguised levity of certain occupants of one of the “Amen pews,” he may venture to regret that the reaction has been so sharp and violent. A trifle more shading and solemnity of tone, a greater degree of dignity and reverence, as of people engaged in religious worship, would make one feel that the old leaven had not been entirely eliminated, that its power for good, when directed and restrained, was still recognized and operative. “Mittelmass” as “Beste Strass” is a hard road for even the wisest of people to find and follow.

Abutting on the square, and directly opposite the end of Main Street, is the old Hill Burying Ground. It contains many ancient and curious epitaphs, some of which prove that even in early New England the schoolmaster was at times abroad. The oldest grave bears the date 1677. Among the epitaphs the most famous is inscribed upon the headstone of John Jack, a negro, composed, it is said, by the Rev. Daniel Bliss. It is an interesting specimen of antithesis, and attracts much attention.

Leaving the square by the road which passes in front of “The Colonial,” a walk of about half a mile brings us to the Old North Bridge, the scene of “Concord Fight” (as the townspeople invariably call it). The approach by an avenue

of pines, forming an effective vista, is particularly pleasing. On the hither side of the stream stands the monument erected by the town in 1836, and bearing this inscription:

HERE
ON THE 19TH OF APRIL 1775
WAS MADE THE FIRST FORCIBLE RESISTANCE TO
BRITISH AGGRESSION
ON THE OPPOSITE BANK STOOD THE AMERICAN MILITIA
HERE STOOD THE INVADING ARMY
AND ON THIS SPOT THE FIRST OF THE ENEMY FELL
IN THE WAR OF THAT REVOLUTION
WHICH GAVE INDEPENDENCE TO THESE UNITED STATES
IN GRATITUDE TO GOD AND IN THE LOVE OF FREEDOM
THIS MONUMENT WAS ERECTED
A. D. 1836.

By the side of the road, within a little enclosure, is the grave of two British soldiers who fell in this first skirmish. The long, heavy musket belonging to one of them is preserved in the local museum.

Crossing the stream by the little bridge, still "rude," "arched," and ancient-looking, we step upon the ground occupied by the Provincial forces in that memorable fight. Here, upon a granite base, rises the bronze statue of the "Minute Man," by Mr. C. D. French, a Concord artist who designed and modeled the cast in his Concord studio. It has been called "the most artistic statue that stands out of doors in America." The figure of the young farmer, alert, expectant, undaunted, is instinct with life; the details are deserving of the closest study. His costume, the old-fashioned plough upon which he leans, and the ancient flint-lock musket which he grasps are, it is said, careful copies of the originals which the young artist used as models. Upon the base are cut the first lines of Emerson's "Concord Hymn," sung at the dedication of the monument, April 19, 1875:

By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world.

It has been well said: "Few towns can furnish a poet, a sculptor, and an occasion!"

Returning to the main road, and retracing our steps toward the square, we are rejoiced to find that the very first house on the right, set back from the road and immediately adjoining the battle ground, is "the Old Manse"—shrine of foremost interest to many a literary pilgrim. Two high posts of granite mark the entrance to an avenue of once noble but now decaying trees which extend for about two hundred feet to the door of the house. Nathaniel Hawthorne first called it "the Old Manse," and it was here that some of the most delicate flowers of his fancy expanded into bloom. But apart from his connection with it the house has a singularly interesting history. It was built in 1765 by Ralph Waldo Emerson's grandfather, then minister of Concord, who, from one of its windows, beheld the fight at the bridge. Very early in the war he joined the American army as chaplain, but died of fever in October, 1776. After Mr. Emerson's death the Rev. Ezra Ripley, who had succeeded to the pulpit and had married the widow of his predecessor, occupied the house until his death in 1841, after a pastorate of more than forty years. During this period his house was the intellectual centre of Concord. Here, too, Ralph Waldo Emerson, grandson of Mrs. Ripley, often came, and it was here that much of his early literary work was done. The ancient dining room, with its tall clock, open fireplace, and set of curious, high-backed chairs, recalls the days of the Ripleys; but it is the chamber directly above this that is the most interesting in the old house. It was here that Emerson wrote "Nature" and many of his best poems. Hawthorne used it as his study, describing it in his "Mosses From An Old Manse," which was written here. The old writing chair, with broad, flat arm, used by him and Emerson in this room, is preserved in the Antiquarian Society's collection.

The Old Manse enshrines within its walls the associations and memories of a hundred and thirty-eight years, and yet,

in the evening of its days, it is still habitable. Descendants of the Ripley family occupy it during the summer months; and as it stands embowered in shade and hoary with age, its grounds sloping gently to the river and resounding with the shouts of merry children, it is, all things considered, the most romantic of Concord's literary shrines. In my affections, at least, it holds first and last place.

A little beyond the Manse, on the opposite side of the road, is a house still more ancient—the oldest, in fact, in Concord. A portion of it, still standing, is said to have been erected in 1644. It was owned by Elisha Jones at the time of Concord Fight, and is commonly known as “the Elisha Jones house.” The present owner, Judge John S. Keyes, has carefully preserved many relics of the time, and is an authority on older Concord history. Near one of the doors may still be seen the hole made by a British bullet, fired at Elisha Jones as he was coming out of his door on the morning of the fight.

Returning to Monument Square, we go next out the Lexington Road. A few rods to the east, on the left side, stands the house of the Concord Antiquarian Society, one of the oldest buildings in the town. Since 1886 it has been owned by the society and is used as a repository of old china, furniture, and other articles, all collected in Concord. One room is devoted entirely to Thoreau relics—a sorry lot, it must be admitted!

A few rods beyond, where the Lincoln Road diverges to the right, stands the Emerson house—a plain, square, wooden structure, partly hidden from view by a clump of pines. Mr. Emerson lived here from 1835 until his death in 1882. In this house all of his later and maturer works were written; and it is perhaps safe to say that no house in America has sheltered so many of the world's famous literary men and women. Miss Ellen Emerson, daughter of the venerated seer, is the present occupant of the house.

Continuing on down the Lexington Road, and passing *en route* a beautiful farm, whose broad and fertile acres, large out-buildings, fine draught horses, and blooded cattle speak

volumes for the richness of Concord meadows, we come, after a few minutes' walk to the "Orchard House," once the home of the Alcotts. A little to the rear, on the hillside, stands the diminutive School of Philosophy, a wooden building, hideously plain, in which were held for some years the meetings of the Concord philosophers, or "Transcendentalists," as they came to be called. It was while the Alcotts lived in the Orchard House that the gifted daughter, Louisa, wrote those delightful stories, "Little Men," "Little Women," etc., whose enormous sales turned the tide of family disaster and made it possible later on to purchase a more desirable property on the Main Street of the village. Dr. W. T. Harris, National Commissioner of Education, owned and occupied the house for a number of years after the Alcotts had vacated; but it is now without a tenant, the grounds are neglected, and house and school are fast going to ruin. An imaginative mind might see typified in this state of things the decay of the Transcendental School, with its elaborately constructed system and its wondrous vocabulary; but, if we are to accept the conclusions arrived at by the Emerson Memorial School, held during the past summer at Concord and Boston, such an inference would be hasty and without foundation.

Just beyond the "Orchard" stands the "Wayside," another house with a most interesting history. When Bronson Alcott came to Concord with his family in 1845, he bought a small farm with an old house upon it, which he rebuilt and christened "Hillside." A few years later it passed into the hands of Nathaniel Hawthorne (the Alcotts moving into the "Orchard"), and was renamed by him "Wayside." Here he lived after his return from England until his death in 1864. Daniel Lothrop, the Boston publisher, came next into possession, and here still resides his widow, who, as "Margaret Sidney," has acquired fame by her juvenile books, "Five Little Peppers and How They Grew," "What the Seven Did," etc.

The Wayside, as its name implies, stands only a few yards

back from the high road. Directly behind it a ridge of land rises abruptly to the height of sixty or seventy feet, running parallel with the road from the village to a point some distance beyond. About one half of the house, as it now is, existed at the time of the Revolution, and the low ceilings with heavy beams protruding, together with the gambrel roof of the older part, attest its antiquity. Hawthorne, after he came into possession, made some changes and additions. Over many of the doors and windows he put gables, one room on the ground floor having seven—a reminiscence, it is said, of his popular romance, "The House of the Seven Gables." There are eight flights of stairs in the house, the top one leading to the famous Tower Room, a square structure above the main building. This he used as a study. It is thoroughly secluded—a kind of nest among the tree-tops, some of the branches on one side actually brushing the panes. The room is furnished just as Hawthorne left it. The chairs and writing desk are severely plain. In his last years he sought relief from writing in a cramped position by using a high desk which he had built in the corner near a window. Standing, however, as he must have, in his own light, it is difficult to see how it could have been of any practical use. The room is sadly marred by some atrocious wall paintings (arctic scenes and other preposterous things), executed some years since, as a labor of love, by a well-meaning but misguided artist. In this tower room Hawthorne wrote his "Tanglewood Tales" for children, his English sketches, which formed the volume called "Our Old Home," and fragments of several unfinished works. The manuscript of "The Dolliver Romance" was found after his death in a little wall cupboard on the stairs leading to the tower, and was buried with him.

On the crest of the ridge behind the house Hawthorne had another study—his favorite retreat. Here, among the trees and shrubbery, he used to pace back and forth by the hour, "dreaming as many unwritten books, perhaps, as those he published." The path worn by his restless feet is kept open,

and in the tallest pine on the brow of the hill (his own tree) a spacious platform, with seats for ten or twelve people, has been erected. Mrs. Lothrop, who uses the Wayside as a summer residence, takes a commendable pride in this home of genius. Every Hawthorne relic is carefully preserved, and she is happy to show the place to any one whose interest in the master and his work justifies what would be otherwise an intrusion.

Even now we have not exhausted the resources of the Lexington Road. With the names of Emerson, the Alcotts, and Hawthorne must be placed that of Ephraim W. Bull; for, by a strange coincidence, in the garden of the "Grapevine Cottage," which adjoins the Wayside, originated the world-renowned Concord grape. This deservedly popular variety was produced, about the year 1854, by the scientific process of hybridizing. It is believed to be a cross between the Isabella and a native wild grape discovered by Mr. Bull on the hillside. The parent vine, supported by a trellis, is still shown.

Lexington Road, as we have already noticed, runs close to the base of a sandy ridge. This is the road over which the British force entered the town on the morning of that fateful April day, and over which they made their retreat. After the skirmish at the bridge the Provincials, knowing that the troops must retreat, marched through "the great field" behind the ridge, and lay in wait at the end, a point about one-half mile beyond the Wayside. This flank movement was successful; a sharp encounter here took place, in which seven of the enemy fell, and their retreat now became a rout. A tablet in the stone wall at Meriam's Corner marks the spot. Here the Lexington Road is joined by the Virginia Road, on which, not far from the corner, stands the house in which Henry D. Thoreau was born. Inasmuch, however, as it has been moved from its original location and greatly altered, it is not a landmark of much interest, and is rarely visited by sight-seers.

Of Concord's great literary men and women Thoreau was the only native of the town, whose fame was never in any way associated with another place. He was born in 1817 and was graduated by Harvard College in 1837. Having a distaste for all professions, he worked for a time at the manufacture of lead pencils, until he had succeeded in making one which was pronounced perfect and fully equal to the best of foreign manufacture, when he said he would make no more. This early whim was prophetic of his subsequent career. Regarded by many of his fellow-townsmen as an idler, by others as an irresponsible dreamer, he lived for a good part of the time the life of an Ishmaelite. His experience at Walden—so graphically narrated in the book of that name—is perhaps the best-known incident of his career. The chapters on "Sounds" and "Walden at Night" alone entitle it to rank among the masterpieces of American literature. It will be remembered that it was during Thoreau's residence at Walden (a pond about a mile and a half from the town) that he was arrested one day, while on a visit to the cobbler, and thrown into the local jail for non-payment of taxes. For one night he languished in durance vile, being released on the following day through the kindly offices of Mr. Emerson, who, I believe, went his bail. The story is told with characteristic frankness and *sans froid* in the book "Walden."

In later life Thoreau was noted as a lecturer as well as an author. He mingled more among men, became domesticated, and took a house on the Main Street, where he died on the 6th of May, 1862. This is, by the way, the very house into which the Alcotts moved after abandoning the "Orchard," and is still known as the Thoreau-Alcott house. It stands on the east side of Main Street, three doors from the corner of Thoreau Street.

A quiet Sunday afternoon is perhaps the most appropriate time for a visit to Sleepy Hollow Cemetery. Leaving the square by Bedford Street, a walk of five minutes brings us to the main entrance. The singular fitness of the name,

"Sleepy Hollow," is at once made apparent. The architect, in laying out this now famous cemetery (in 1853) wisely followed the natural contour of the ground, and has left undisturbed the amphitheatre in the centre which had borne the name of Sleepy Hollow long before it was thought of as a place of burial. Crossing this amphitheatre we ascend the opposite slope and strike, at its western end, the "Ridge Path," on which are the graves we care most to see.

Just where the ridge begins we find the Hawthorne plot, surrounded by an arbor-vitæ hedge which has suffered so shamefully at the hands of souvenir-seeking tourists that the family have found it necessary to erect a tall wire fence, with stout posts and padlocked gate, to protect it from complete confiscation—an interesting illustration of what is called abroad "a typical American trait!" Within this double enclosure, painfully forbidding, rest the mortal remains of the great romancer. His eloquent epitaph consists only of the name "Hawthorne" on a plain white stone. By an unkind fate his devoted wife is separated from him in death. Dying abroad, her body was buried in English soil.

The graves of the Thoreau and Alcott families immediately adjoin the Hawthorne plot. The grave of Henry Thoreau is not distinguished in any way above the other family graves. It is marked by a simple stone, bearing his name and the dates of his birth and death. In the case of the Alcotts the grave of Louisa is given special prominence by a tall and rather graceful stone, easily recognized from the amphitheatre below. The talented authoress died only two days after her father. Her death was hastened, if not caused, it is said, by her determination to attend his funeral when convalescent from a severe illness.

Continuing for a short distance along the Ridge Path, we see, on the right, the unmistakable Emerson monument. It is a huge boulder of rose quartz, rough and rugged as it came from the quarry, and having on a bit of flat surface the inscription:

RALPH WALDO
EMERSON

BORN IN BOSTON MAY 25 1803
DIED IN CONCORD APRIL 27 1882
THE PASSIVE MASTER LENT HIS HAND
TO THE VAST SOUL THAT O'ER HIM PLANNED.

The couplet is a quotation from Emerson's own poem, "The Problem." By a curious caprice of chance, one corner of the boulder, when looked at from a point of the Ridge Path about twelve feet distant, shows a rather striking profile of the Sphinx! It is a resemblance which usually escapes observation, but is worth looking for. In the same enclosure are the graves of Emerson's mother, wife, and young son. Two corners of the lot are marked by stately pines—fit sentinels above the dust of him who, in life, loved them so well.

Below, on the hillside, on "Glen Path," are the graves of the Hoar family, whose name and fame have added not a little to the glory of Concord. The principal monument, a massive and somewhat ungainly structure of dark granite, commemorates the Hon. Samuel Hoar, a man held in the highest veneration by the community in which he spent his long and useful life, and who, it is said by one who knew him, "did more, by the probity and simple grandeur of his life, to elevate the standard of living than any other man in the town or county." The noble epitaph which in this case, it is said, speaks unchallenged truth, is too long to quote. In the upper corner of the lot is a grave marked by an inscription which interested me greatly. The simple lines speak eloquently of the character they commemorate:

EDWARD SHERMAN HOAR
BORN DEC. 22 1823
DIED FEB. 22 1893

He cared nothing for the wealth or fame
his rare genius might easily have won.
But his ear knew the songs of all birds.
His eye saw the beauty of flowers and
the secret of their life. His unerring taste
delighted in what was best in books.
So his pure and quiet days reaped their
rich harvest of wisdom and content.

Most of the epitaphs in this lot were written by the Hon. E. R. Hoar (died in 1895), son of Samuel Hoar, and known in Concord as Judge Hoar. It was he, by the way, who, in conjunction with Mr. Emerson, composed the inscriptions for the various historical tablets in and about Concord, a fact which accounts for their excellent taste and blameless English. The Hon. George Frisbie Hoar, the veteran Senator from Massachusetts, who, since 1877 has represented his state with such signal distinction, and whose name is a synonym for integrity and high-minded patriotism, is a younger brother of the last-named. His boyhood days were spent in Concord; but his home since young manhood has been the neighboring town of Worcester. The Hon. Samuel Hoar, a son of Judge Hoar, is to-day, by common consent, Concord's leading citizen. His high-columned, colonial house (the old Hoar mansion) is the most striking residence on Main Street. It is opposite the end of Academy Lane, and not far from the Public Library. It is a noteworthy fact that four United States Congressmen have been supplied by a half acre of Concord ground.

Before leaving Sleepy Hollow let us not forget the grave of Elizabeth Peabody, a sister of Mrs. Hawthorne, who devoted herself through a long and busy life to philanthropic and educational labors. She was one of the early interpreters of Froebel's system of child development, and it was chiefly through her instrumentality that the Kindergarten was introduced into this country.

The Public Library of Concord is an institution of which the town is justly proud. It is a handsome brick structure, well placed on a triangular piece of ground at the junction of Main Street and Sudbury Road. The building was erected and given to the town, with funds for its maintenance, a generation ago, by William Munroe, a native and citizen of Concord. Besides its 35,000 volumes the library contains a number of paintings and busts by Concord artists. A special alcove is devoted entirely to books by Concord authors—

a feature unusual, perhaps unique, among public libraries. The records of the librarian show a surprisingly general use, not only of the lending books but of the reference works as well, and of the magazines and periodicals kept on file in the reading room. It may be questioned whether any other town in the country can, when the matter of population is considered, make nearly so favorable a showing. Little Concord demanded a library, and got it, long before Mr. Carnegie began to look about in search of towns that might perhaps accept one.

There is an epigram anent Concord which runs: "The 'lions' are all dead; but their 'dens' we have still with us." Like most epigrams this is partially, not entirely, true. Of living "lions" there are yet a few to be seen about the old haunts. For example, Mr. Frank B. Sanborn, the veteran schoolmaster, essayist, biographer, publicist, and poet is without doubt very much alive and unquestionably a lion. His den is at the upper end of Elm Street, in a thicket of trees and shrubs just on the edge of the river. He is a marked figure on Concord streets, and cannot be mistaken, even by the stranger. Mr. Sanborn has had an active, eventful life, and has numbered among his closest friends such widely divergent natures as Emerson, Thoreau, John Brown, and William Ellery Channing. At the meeting of the Emerson Memorial School, held during the past summer for three consecutive weeks, with a daily morning session at Concord and an evening sitting in Boston, Mr. Sanborn presided throughout at the morning sessions, opening and conducting the discussions at the end of each paper. His reputation as a frank, fearless critic was well sustained—particularly by his scathing arraignment of Harvard College for her step-motherly treatment of a sincere and earnest son during the years of his intellectual florescence.

Another living lion of Concord is Doctor Edward Emerson, son of the poet-philosopher. Although set apart by his father for the profession of medicine, and although fully

qualified, by training and skill, as a practicing physician, the native bent toward art and letters would not down. Dr. Emerson, in consequence, soon abandoned medicine and gave himself up to his self-chosen pursuits. He has done good work as a painter, and has proved himself a most appreciative and sympathetic interpreter of his father's system of thought. His recently completed "Centenary Edition" of Emerson's works is a monument of industry and scholarly acumen. Dr. Emerson lives on an estate fronting the Assabet River, a short distance above the town. His studio stands on a little bluff commanding an attractive reach of the stream.

In a very old house on the Lowell Road, a few paces from the Bulkeley tablet, lives a charming woman, whose name I will not divulge, but whose identity can readily be guessed by Concord residents, among whom she is well-known and most highly esteemed. I will not call her a lion; she is far too gentle for that! But I will say that in her delightful home I spent the most memorable half hour of my fortnight's sojourn in Concord. To hear this cultivated woman talk is a privilege; to have her show you the treasures of her house and garden is a treat, intellectual and æsthetic. Of course she has traveled widely, and has learned well the lessons which travel alone can impart to a susceptible and perceptive mind. I have said that her house is very old; but that statement alone can give no idea of the simple beauty of the architecture or the infinite charm of the furnishings. You must know that the great open fire places are of such singular perfection in proportion, line, and general effect, that they have been accurately measured and reproduced for modern country houses by a well-known firm of New York architects; that the wide hall and spacious rooms are full of antique mahogany furniture; that the corner china closets are stocked with perfect specimens of Bristol, Castleford, and Lowestoft—not collected, understand, but family heirlooms; that the walls of the library are covered with rare old prints and proof etchings, and its crowded shelves hold first editions *en galore*,

from Elzevirs and Alduses to a large-paper quarto of "The Gentle Shepherd"; that in the high-fenced garden there are bewildering beds of gay, old-fashioned flowers—all this you must know to appreciate the good fortune that befell me one bright July morning, on the Lowell Road in Concord, not above a stone's throw from the village green.

That Concord's pride in her history, her fame, her lions (dead and living), is just and right will not, I think, be questioned. The thousands who flock annually to her shrines confirm in her this feeling. But, apart from her historic and literary associations, the visitor of to-day cannot help but feel, in other ways and for other reasons, her abiding, all-pervading charm.

Concord is only twenty miles from Boston, and can now be reached by electric car from Park Street and Scollay Square. And yet, despite her proximity to a great and busy city, she is quiet, peaceful, idyllic in her repose. With a population of about four thousand souls she has not a factory or business concern of any size within her borders. The smoke of furnace, the whirl of machinery, the bustle of trade, are unknown to her. The horror of a weekly or monthly pay-day, with its usual concomitants, she is innocent of; for there is no such thing as a drinking place within her bounds. She has no slums, no poor, vicious, or criminal class. Police and constables languish from *ennui*, and the use of a jail is forgotten. Her streets echo to no sound louder than the hoof beats of a horse upon the natural soil; for macadam, stone, or asphalt are unknown. For her sidewalks the compact sand, bordered by a bit of turf, is all-sufficient. The patriarchal elms, planted at regular intervals along this strip of green, often meet above the roadway, forming a natural arch which, when extended through a long, level street, produces a most pleasing, vista-like effect.

The elms lining the streets are cared for by the town authorities. They are trimmed regularly by a force of men provided with all the necessary implements—wagon, extension

ladders, ropes, shears, saw, and tar buckets. The lower limbs are cut off close to the trunk, the wounds being closed with liquid tar. This preserves the lofty, arched effect before referred to. All decayed and broken branches are lopped off, and the trunks are encircled with tar-soaked bands. Such a method of treatment—aiming at health, symmetry, and uniform beauty—contrasts strikingly with the haphazard and brutal butchery of trees practiced in the towns and cities of the Middle States. Common sense, guided by example, would, it seems to me, teach thinking men that the extreme docking of trees, which leaves them little better than unsightly stumps, must be in violation of every law of nature, beauty, and simple sanity.

In her architecture, too, Concord gives evidence of rare good sense. Instead of taxing the ingenuity of designers and draughtsmen to produce novel, original, and perhaps fantastic effects, Concord, out of the wisdom that comes with age, experience, reflection, and restraint, has preserved in her homes the simple, colonial type—unpretentious, inexpensive, and withal so appropriate, and so satisfying to the eye. There are few "freaks" in Concord, and in the good company they are forced to keep their vulgarity is all the more marked. To one confronted commonly by the heterogeneous oddity of individualistic architecture, where the best houses not only fail to conform to any prevailing type, but are in themselves very often composite and unclassifiable—to one, I say, brought up amidst such bewildering and barbaric variety, the unity, harmony, dignity, and restraint of a New England village like Concord—faithful to her ideals and traditions—is gratifying in the extreme. With her cottages set well back from the street—not crowded, like idle gossips, to the very sidewalk line; with her lawns and gardens sloping gently to the river—the lazy, winding river, paradise of canoers; with her broad meadows and smiling slopes and fir-clad knolls; with all her quiet, unobtrusive, yet convincing charms, Concord is to-day an ideal home.

If, however, the whole truth must be told, she has, so far as I discovered, two drawbacks. They are mosquitoes and sight-seers. The former are the necessary accompaniment of her sluggish river; the latter, the penalty of her fame. Against the mosquitoes she wages uncompromising warfare with screens and nets and pungent joss sticks. The sight-seers she endures with a sweet resignation, suspiciously akin to complacency. Perhaps, after all, like a certain great poet who, to his chagrin, was passed unnoticed in a lane near his home by two strangers, she would be a bit disappointed if the crowds did not come and gape and ravage her borders for souvenirs.

III.

THE ESSENTIAL CONTENT OF THE RELIGIOUS CONSCIOUSNESS.

BY PROF. ELMER E. POWELL, PH.D.

Now-a-days, when the ethical aspect of Christianity is so much (and rightly) emphasized, the two questions, "What is religion?" and "What, if anything, is just as good as religion?" are often confounded. We will, therefore, observe in advance, that with the question, whether anything may well take the place of religion, we are at present not concerned. We shall simply try to determine, independently of all questions as to its truth and absolute worth, what religion is. It should be observed further that what we are to define is not religion within the limits of Christianity merely, but religion in the most general sense,—religion as a universal phenomenon. Moreover, as the title of this paper implies, we shall not have occasion to take account of the institutional aspect of religion, but shall confine our attention exclusively to its primary character as an experience of the individual.

On account of the variety of religious phenomena brought to our knowledge by the investigations of recent years, and on account of the consequent confusion of tongues in this field of discussion, some seem to question the propriety of attempting as yet a universally valid definition. It is thought that the only thing practicable is for each individual to define what he himself means by the term without presuming to ask universal assent to his particular conception. Professor James, for example, in harmony with that undogmatic spirit which is one of the most admirable characteristics of his mind, ventures in his recent work on *The Varieties of Religious Experience* to frame a definition only for the purposes of that treat-

ise, and asks us "arbitrarily" to accept it.* But to define anything is, after all, only to describe it in such a way as to enable us to distinguish it from other things. It is evident, therefore, that if the term is to have no single fixed connotation, one person will mean one thing by it, and another another; and that we shall continue to be afflicted with evasion, vagueness, confusion, logomachy. If we cannot agree approximately as to what it is we are talking about when we discuss religion, the consistent thing to do is to cease discussing. It is impossible, of course, to formulate a statement that will win the assent of all; but it is our duty nevertheless to attempt to determine the meaning of the conception in a way to *deserve* recognition by all as *scientifically* accurate, whatever liberties of speech we may allow ourselves in the language of practical life.

What men have always and everywhere concurred in calling religion has three aspects answering to the threefold life of man: (1) a doctrinal aspect, in which it appears as a body of beliefs, and is related to man's intellectual life; (2) an emotional aspect, in which it may be described in terms of feeling; and (3) a practical aspect, in which it presents itself as an expression of man's volitional life. An adequate definition must take into account all three of these aspects. The great diversity among traditional and current definitions is chiefly due to the fact that most of them seize some one aspect of religion, while few recognize all three aspects at once. For some writers religion is a "belief," a belief in God, in gods, in spirits, or in something else; for others it is a "sentiment," variously described as "veneration," "reverence," a "feeling of dependence," etc.; for still others it is "practices" of some kind, such as rites and ceremonies, morality, or something else that implies a relation to man's active powers only. Defining it in its completeness, we would say: *Religion is the emotions and activities determined by belief in a higher personal power, or in higher personal powers, with whom man is assumed to*

* Pages 26-31.

sustain relations. In this statement all three of the aspects, or elements, of religion are given due recognition. Moreover, it will be found sufficiently comprehensive to include fetichism and Christianity, demonolatry and the worship of the Heavenly Father, polytheism and monotheism; and at the same time sufficiently limited by the words "higher" and "personal" to exclude merely human relationships on the one hand and atheistic phenomena on the other.

In the concrete religious phenomena of the world the three elements are of course variously emphasized. Even in the same cult the peculiar constitution of different individuals will occasion that in some cases the doctrinal element appear the most prominent, in other cases the emotional element, and in others the volitional element; but in no case will any one element exist entirely alone. Religious beliefs wholly apart from religious emotions and activities, religious emotions wholly apart from religious beliefs and activities, and religious activities, or practices, wholly apart from religious emotions and beliefs, are mere abstractions that have no existence in the concrete world of fact. Religious emotions in particular are frequently spoken of as though they could exist out of all relation to beliefs. As a matter of fact, however, religious emotions are only ordinary emotions (love, joy, fear, admiration, etc.) as conditioned by a religious object. Hence religious emotions without religious beliefs, or assumptions, cannot exist. Of religious practices the same is true. Practices of any sort which have no ground in beliefs or assumptions are insane. The only question that can arise, therefore, is as to what beliefs are the *essential* conditions of religious emotions and practices; and it is to this question in particular that we invite attention.

In the definition proposed we have assumed that the beliefs which condition religious emotions and practices must include a belief in a higher personal power, or in higher personal powers, assumed to sustain relations with men. The word "personal" is important, and expresses the truth which we

desire especially to emphasize. It is a point which, in philosophical discussions of religion, is often either left in vague uncertainty, or at most only implied. But as "personal," when applied to the ultimate reality, is a word which some profess not to understand, we will explain, without attempting here an accurate definition of a term so often employed in a vague sense, that by personality we do not mean, of course, form and "local habitation," but only the sum of those qualities which constitute a free intelligence, or, to describe it in the lowest possible terms, the cognitive and volitional consciousness. The word "self-consciousness," as ordinarily used, expresses our meaning with sufficient precision. This much at least, we contend, is required of its object by religion. The typical religious consciousness requires much more than this, such as various interests, sensibilities, moral qualities, etc. If it be said that this is gross anthropomorphism, that the "higher power" of religion is according to us only a human being with some of his limitations removed, we can only reply that, whether anthropomorphism or not, it is what has always and everywhere been essential to religion. It is not necessary, of course, that the object worshipped be expressly defined as "personal," or that any personal attributes be expressly mentioned; it is not necessary even that the name "God" appear, for the thing may be present in the absence of the name. It is quite sufficient that such attributes be assumed, and the evidence that they are assumed may conceivably be only the behavior of the votaries. But no forms of human experience can with propriety be called religion, unless they ascribe, explicitly or implicitly, personal qualities to a higher power or to higher powers.

The fact that the recognition of personality is sometimes only implicit, has occasioned some very extraordinary and contradictory assertions concerning both particular religions and religion in general. A typical example of these occurs in Daniel G. Brinton's *Religions of Primitive Peoples*. In one place he affirms that "There is no one belief or set

of beliefs which constitutes religion. We are apt to suppose that every creed must teach a belief in a God or gods, in an immortal soul, and in a divine government of the world. The Parliament of Religions, which lately met at Chicago, announced, in its preliminary call, these elements as essential to the idea of religion. No mistake could be greater." * From this it would seem that there can be religion without a God, or gods, or anything of the kind. But elsewhere in the same volume it is said, quite inconsistently with this, that "It makes no difference whether we analyze the superstitions of the rudest savages, or the lofty utterances of John the Evangelist, or of Spinoza the 'god-intoxicated philosopher';† we shall find one and the same postulate to the faith of all." "This universal postulate, the psychic origin of all religious thought, is the recognition, or, if you please, the assumption, *that conscious volition is the ultimate source of all force*. It is the belief that behind the sensuous, phenomenal world, distinct from it, giving it form, existence, and activity, lies the ultimate, invisible, immeasurable power of mind, of conscious will, of intelligence, analogous in some way to our own; and,—mark this essential corollary,—*that*

* Page 28.

† I cannot refrain from calling attention in passing to the serious, though common, misconception of Spinoza here expressed. To convince oneself that Spinoza did *not* assume "that conscious volition is the ultimate source of all force," it is necessary to read but a page at random from any one of his writings. It is a view which he is never weary of combating. In fact, what he says is: "In rerum natura nullum datur contingens: sed omnia ex *necessitate* divinae naturae determinata sunt a certo modo existendum et operandum" (Ethica, I., prop. 29); and "Ostendam ad Dei naturam neque intellectum, neque voluntatem pertinere" (Ethica, I., prop. 16, scholium). The value of the terms "Deus" and "divina" is determined by Spinoza's own language employed elsewhere, "Deus seu natura" (Ethica, IV., Præfatio).—As to the epithet "god-intoxicated philosopher," it is a mere rhetorical phrase, invented to disconcert those who recognizing the irreligious character of Spinoza's philosophy, sought to discredit the man. Now that the expression has gained currency, it is taken seriously, by those who have not had occasion to study him at first hand, as if it were the critical estimate of scholars.

man is in communication with it." With the exception of the reference to Spinoza, we would not dissent from this statement; but we are unable to reconcile it with the one first quoted. For the assumption of "conscious volition," of "mind," of "intelligence," as "the ultimate source of all force" is only another way of saying "a belief in a God or gods" and "in a divine government of the world."

Buddhism is often referred to as an "atheistic" religion; but, if we are consistent, we must regard the expression as a contradiction in terms. By such language we confound things that are not only essentially different, but quite opposite in character. As a matter of fact, wherever we find temples, ceremonies, prayers, or worship of any kind, we have the implicit assumption of a higher power or of higher powers to which personal attributes are ascribed. Purely ethical, humanitarian, or political associations may take on some of the aspects of religious organizations, but if they involve the recognition of no higher personal power, they cannot properly be called religious. To class them as such is to put together things that are essentially different, and to use misleading language. If any organization of this kind is commonly known as "religious," it is because it is commonly supposed to imply in its forms and activities a reference to some higher power or powers with personal attributes. It may even occur that an ethico-philosophical system which is atheistic at the beginning develops later into a religion; or that the same system is atheism for the philosophically initiated and is theism or polytheism for the multitude. In Buddhism we seem to have an illustration of both these cases. The circumstance that the Buddhism of the people is religion, despite the fact that the Buddhism of Gautama and of the philosophers now in different varieties of the cult is said to be atheism, accounts for the frequent paradoxical reference to the system as an "atheistic religion." Such language is sometimes convenient for purposes of characterization, and possesses a certain rhe-

torical value, but should never be taken for exact scientific statement. The fact is that Buddhism is an anomaly, the name covering two things that logically exclude each other—atheism and religion; and, if we are to use exact language, we ought to separate it into these two elements and call each by its right name. For convenience we may, if we choose, loosely call the aggregate of phenomena known as Buddhism either atheism or religion, or even “atheistic religion”; but in this case we should distinctly recognize that we are not speaking with logical precision. The anomalous and inconsistent character of Buddhism does not warrant us in extending the term religion so as to obliterate the distinction between religion and atheism.

What has been said may seem to class among those who are in no sense religious the pious agnostics of our day, *i. e.*, those who have no definite conceptions in regard to the supersensible world, and yet, by conforming to the requirements of religious organizations and even by relishing some kinds of religious exercises, appear to possess a genuine religious interest. In such persons we have, in fact, something like a case of double personality; and they are to be classed as religious and non-religious by turns. When they put on the scientific frame of mind and distinctly recognize the invalidity (for them) of all theological and mythological forms of thought, they are non-religious (atheists, if you will); but when they surrender themselves to a system of religious conceptions as if these were true, and are emotionally and volitionally affected thereby, they are religious. Few men, perhaps none, are absolutely consistent in any respect, and it should not seem strange if many are inconsistent in the matter of religion. It is even possible for a constantly and devoutly religious man to hold a theoretical system of implicit atheism (implicit, I say, but not explicit); and indeed the history of thought exhibits not a few such cases. In fact systems of Christian theology have sometimes contained elements of undeveloped atheism. But on this account to identify religion and atheism would be absurd.

The distinctive character of religion appears more clearly when we observe wherein it differs from morality on the one hand and from metaphysics on the other. Morality is simply conformity to the recognized standards of conduct, and does not necessarily imply a reference to anything beyond the individual's immediate relations. It is not necessarily religious. In fact many moral men are irreligious and some systems of morality are atheistic. In Christianity we have a religion that includes an ideal morality, but the purely ethical content of Christianity even, if taken alone, does not constitute religion. Morality becomes religion only when norms of life are recognized not merely as human ideals, but as expressions of a divine will. Accordingly Kant has defined religion, *i. e.*, rational religion, as "the recognition of all our duties as divine commands." * This would no doubt be accepted by many as a sufficiently accurate definition of essential Christianity. The important truth expressed is that duties alone are not sufficient to constitute religion. In order to become religion, duties must be regarded as sanctioned by a divine person.

The circumstance that monotheistic religion (on its intellectual side) and metaphysics have to do with the same object, namely the ultimate reality, often occasions an oversight of the specific difference between religion and metaphysics. Every kind of monism assumes a unitary world-ground, and often calls the ultimate reality "God"; but every kind of monism is not therefore monotheism, or in some sense a religious conception of the world. Whether it is or not, depends on the attributes with which the world-ground is clothed. If monism ascribes personal qualities of any sort to its absolute, it becomes monotheism, a religion; otherwise not. It may describe the ultimate reality as "infinite," "absolute," "immutable," "eternal," etc.; but none of these predicates consti-

* "Die Religion innerhalb d. Grenzen d. blossen Vernunft," Viertes Stück, Erster Theil: "Religion ist (subjectiv betrachtet) das Erkenntniß aller unserer Pflichten als göttlicher Gebote."

tutes the ultimate reality a religious object. "Infinite" mechanism, for example, would not be able to excite "reverence," "veneration," "respect," "love," or any other emotions characteristically religious. Certainly nothing better could be said of "immutable" coexistence and sequence, or of "eternal" dirt. At most such things could excite mere wonder. Some elements of ideality at least must be present in an object that conditions "reverence," "veneration," and similar emotions; and ideality implies in that far personality. Modern Transcendental Idealism, as represented by Emerson, may be regarded, therefore, as still within, though barely within, the pale of religion; for, although its God tends theoretically to "evaporate"* into an abstraction, practically the evaporation never becomes quite complete. In different degrees the Emersonians personify the world. As to the "feeling of dependence," which has sometimes been regarded as the very soul of religion, let it be observed that not every feeling of dependence is meant, but the feeling of dependence on the "Infinite," and, by tacit assumption, on the "Infinite" conceived as clothed in personal attributes. Dependence on infinite force, on infinite gravitation for example, is not what is meant, and would still not be, if in addition to "infinite" we bestowed other imposing titles such as "absolute," "immutable," and "eternal." Neither have distinctively religious practices ever been determined by metaphysical attributes alone. Men have never been quite stupid enough to perform religious rites before impersonal mechanism, even if conceived as immeasurably big, or to offer sacrifices and prayers to a system of mathematical relations, though regarded as "eternal." Such acts, when closely examined, are found to be always attended by a recognition of the personality of the religious object. Toward objects like those just mentioned men have never even assumed the corresponding mental attitudes which, in the more refined religious exercises, sometimes take the place of outward acts of worship. Mere infinity, mere eternity, mere

*Professor James's expression.

absoluteness, and mere causality, have no value whatever for the religious consciousness. Professor James is entirely right when, of a God constituted of metaphysical attributes alone, he says: "From the point of view of practical religion, the metaphysical monster which they offer to our worship is an absolutely worthless invention of the scholarly mind." *

Mere ontology is not theology, and the adjustment of oneself to an assumed ultimate reality is not necessarily religion. Whether it is or not, depends on the *kind* of ultimate reality assumed. The fundamental weakness in Edward Caird's treatment of religion, as of most writers whose conception of religion is intellectualistic, consists in his tendency to confound religion and metaphysics. He says, for example, "The religious like the scientific consciousness seeks to find the reason or principle of the particular in the universal; and it differs from science mainly in this, that it cannot rest except in the infinite unity which underlies all the differences of the finite." This recognizes both a certain agreement and a certain difference between the religious interest and the scientific. The difference noticed is in fact that which obtains not between the scientific and religious interests, but between the scientific interest (as manifested in the particular sciences) and the philosophic (metaphysical) interest, which cannot rest except in a unitary conception of the world; and the difference is only one of degree, the scientific interest culminating in the philosophical. It is therefore only the scientific interest in its highest development that Caird here calls the religious consciousness. The truth is that religion seeks primarily not "reason and principle," "unity," "the universal," etc. as such, but help, protection, security, peace, fellowship, and other practical goods. "Infinite unity" as such is of absolutely no significance for the distinctively religious consciousness. It is not surprising that elsewhere the same author, though taking some account of the practical aspect of religion, defines it in a way to remove all

* "The Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 447.

grounds for the distinction between irreligion and religion. "A man's religion," he says, "is the expression of his ultimate attitude to the Universe, the summed-up meaning and purport of his whole consciousness of things." * If, as this language implies, any kind of ultimate attitude is religion, then irreligion and aggressive atheism are particular varieties of religion. The point of view is intelligible, of course; but it is evident that, if we adopted Caird's conception, we should be compelled to invent a new term with which to distinguish religion from irreligion. The confusion comes from failure to attribute to religion a *peculiar* object,—an object that differs from a merely metaphysical one in that it possesses personal qualities.

Even some thinkers of strong religious interest, it must be admitted, have hesitated, on account of particular philosophical presuppositions, to accept *theoretically* the personality of the absolute; but they have in that far been inconsistent. Schleiermacher, for example, who in his earlier works hardly employs the word "God," using instead impersonal expressions such as "the infinite," "the universe," "the whole," etc., is constrained later not only to adopt fully the word "God," and to make a distinction between God and the universe, but to clothe "the infinite," for *practical religion*, in the attributes of the definite personal God of traditional theology.† It could not be otherwise. It was impossible for him, as it has been for all other thinkers, to constitute actual, concrete religion without a God of personal attributes.

On account of his reputation and authority, the late Herbert Spencer's conception of religion deserves to be mentioned. It is evidently determined by the desire to effect a permanent reconciliation between science (philosophy) and religion, although the reconciliation turns out to be simply the abolition of reli-

* "Evolution of Religion," Vol. I., p. 30. It is only fair to say that this is not meant to be his final statement of the matter. It is sufficient, however, to characterize his standpoint.

† Compare the "Reden über die Religion" and "Der christliche Glaube."

gion. He finds in every religion two elements: (1) The recognition "that the existence of the world, with all it contains and all which surrounds it, is a mystery ever pressing for interpretation," and (2) "some solution of this mystery." * He contends, however, that the essential element (an element which religion possesses in common with science and philosophy) is the recognition of the mystery, and that religion will become purely religious only when it has completely eliminated the other element, only when it has rejected every solution of the mystery and hence every definite conception concerning ultimate reality. To assume a personal God as the ground of all being is accordingly inconsistent with the very nature of religion! Of this view it is to be said that, apart from the fact that it is purely intellectualistic, taking account only of the doctrinal aspect of religion, it really throws away the essential one of the two elements into which he analyzes religion, and retains the accidental one as alone expressing its true nature. For it can be shown, (1) that religion can get on without mystery (in the sense of the inexplicable), but (2) that it cannot surrender every hypothesis as to the nature of ultimate reality.

Mystery may mean either what cannot be explained on any hypothesis (in this sense the world is a mystery for consistent agnosticism), *i. e.*, absolute mystery; or it may mean what cannot be "scientifically" explained, *i. e.*, understood as a particular case under some general fact or law (conceived as mechanical in its operation) already familiar to our experience. For example, for "the existence of the world with all it contains," materialism offers a scientific explanation in this sense when it asserts that all phenomena would turn out on ultimate analysis to be only material particles in motion. If religion has any interest in mystery, it is not in absolute mystery, but only in a world that cannot be explained as the operation of impersonal forces. Religion has its own explanation,

* "First Principles," closing paragraphs of the chapter on "Ultimate Religious Ideas."

—though not a “scientific” one,—of the phenomenal universe. It explains the world as the operation of God, or of gods; and its occasional dread of scientific investigation is due to the apprehension that the sphere of explanation by divine volition may be gradually reduced by science to the vanishing point, where the gods are quite displaced by impersonal forces. In fact, religion can tolerate the modern scientific conception of a world without miracles (though full of mystery) only by interpreting the changeless and universal laws of nature as uniform modes of divine activity. Religion is therefore so far from being the mere recognition of mystery, that it is, on its intellectual side, a particular explanation of mystery.

For absolute mystery religion has no use. The mysterious in this sense is not even agreeable to the religious consciousness. What it cannot explain by postulating a personal cause, perplexes, troubles, chills it. This becomes more and more clear as we advance from the lower to the higher expressions of the religious interest. In naïve polytheism it is indeed easy enough to explain superficially the apparently contradictory aspects of nature as the work of different personalities; but, when we come to monotheism, faith in a personal cause of all things is often staggered by the multiple aspects of the world, especially by the co-existence of good and evil; and this is just because evil is a mystery that cannot be explained by ascribing it directly to a personal cause that is at the same time the father of all good. The inexplicable co-existence of good and evil is so far from being a support to the religious consciousness, as on Spencer’s theory it ought to be, that the religious consciousness (in monotheism) can survive a clear recognition of this dualism only by assuming that the contradiction is after all but apparent, that evil is transitory or good in disguise. When regarded as quite inexplicable, as an absolute mystery, it is fatal to religion.

It is to be regretted that Professor James, in his recent great work on *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, fails

to recognize explicitly the truth that religion requires a personal object. As a consequence of this failure, he seems to have fallen into certain inconsistencies. He defines religion, considered subjectively, as "the feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider divine." * But in his remarks on what is to be understood by "divine," he says there are religions which do not positively assume a God, and cites Buddhism as an example. He seems to think that the divineness of the universe for the religious consciousness may conceivably be "a mere quality like the eye's brilliancy or the skin's softness" and not "a self-conscious life." † That such a view is based on an imperfect analysis of the religious consciousness, we have tried to show above. We would here point out only that, in other parts of his work, Professor James employs expressions which we are unable to reconcile with the breadth of his definition. Toward the end of his volume he says, for example, "Prayer in this wide sense," "as meaning every kind of inward communion or conversation with the power recognized as divine," "is the very soul and essence of religion." ‡ By prayer he understands "no vain exercise of words, no mere repetition of certain sacred formulæ, but the very movement itself of the soul, putting itself in a personal relation of contact with the mysterious power of which it feels the presence." Concerning this language it is to be observed that when the expressions "communion," "conversation," "personal relation," etc., are employed, the personality of the religious object is tacitly assumed. Now if prayer requires a personal object, and if prayer "is the very soul and essence of religion," we ought to conclude that religion requires a personal object. In fact, the word "power," as employed here, has quite a different value from the unequivocally impersonal "force," and seems to imply intelligence and will.

The foregoing discussion is calculated perhaps to create the

* Page 31.

† Page 33.

‡ Page 464.

impression that there prevails great diversity of opinion as to the nature of religion. A survey of the definitions of other philosophers and scholars than those cited would at first deepen this impression.* A careful analysis, however, would show that opinions, though by no means exhibiting unanimity, are not so various as the language employed in different definitions seems to indicate. Many of the so-called definitions were never intended to be scientific statements. Such, for example, is Matthew Arnold's characterization of religion as "morality touched with emotion." Others state merely what a writer accepts in place of religion, and are not seriously meant to describe "religion" at all; as Renan's profession of faith: "My religion is now as ever the progress of reason, in other words the progress of science"; and as Comte's: "Religion consists in regulating each one's individual nature, and forms the rallying point for all the separate individuals." Still others are attempts to define religion or some aspect of it in terms of a particular system of philosophy, and do not necessarily imply a repudiation of all other formulated statements. In this sense we are to take Hegel's language, when he says that religion is "The knowledge possessed by the finite mind of its nature as absolute mind." It would evidently be a mistake to suppose that every variation in the phraseology employed when speaking of religion represents a fundamental difference of conception.

Since historical, comparative, and psychological studies in religion were begun in a scientific spirit, there has been in fact very notable progress toward substantial agreement as to what it is that we are to call religion. In his admirable book on "The Study of Religion," Professor Jastrow has taken pains to trace carefully the historical development of thought on this subject, and finds that, while there is no unanimity as to

* For a number of definitions cited from writers of reputation see the "Appendix" of an excellent article by Professor Leuba entitled, "Introduction to the Psychological Study of Religion" in *The Monist*, January, 1901. The citations that follow we have taken from this.

the origin of religion, there is now general agreement on the following points: (1) There is a connection of some kind between religion and life; (2) One element of religion is the feeling of dependence upon a Power or Powers beyond man's control; (3) The votaries of religion attempt to establish proper relations between themselves and these Powers; and (4) Religion manifests a tendency toward organization. It will be observed, however, that the vital point, whether the religious object is necessarily personal or not, is left in vague uncertainty. To be sure, the word "Power" is here employed, and, as we remarked above, this word ought to imply personal qualities, but in fact it is not always used with a clear consciousness that this is what is meant. When used without further qualification it is after all so vague that it permits a writer, according to the exigencies of the moment, to assume either that it means "personal power" or that it does not. Professor Jastrow could not, of course, be expected to be more explicit than those whose opinions he records. The fact is, there exists so much non-committal on this point that language more definite than his would be inaccurate. But it is time it were generally and clearly recognized, not only that religion possesses the characters enumerated above, but also that it requires a personal object. Romanes does not express more than the truth, when he says: "To speak of the Religion of the Unknowable, the Religion of Cosmism, the Religion of Humanity, and so forth, where the personality of the First Cause is not recognized, is as unmeaning as it would be to speak of the love of a triangle, or the rationality of the equator."

In conclusion, we would repeat that we are not here concerned with the question whether something else may be found to take the place of what has traditionally been called religion. Writers who reject all theological conceptions as groundless, generally contend that the unbeliever who is thoroughly moral, or is sincerely interested in the betterment of society, or is permeated by an enthusiasm for humanity, or is devoted to

the increase of useful knowledge, will be no less valuable to mankind and will be no less secure personally both in this life and in a hypothetical life to come, than he whose character and conduct are determined by theological assumptions.* This contention we are willing to leave unchallenged for the present, provided it is admitted that these kinds of life are not religion, but mere *substitutes* for religion.

* For a systematic statement of this position see J. S. Mill's essay on "The Utility of Religion." It is to be commended for its frankness at least.

IV.

BIOLOGY, THE HANDMAID OF THEOLOGY.

BY PROF. GEORGE LESLIE OMWAKE.

The doctrine of antitheses yielding their contention in a higher synthesis has no better illustration than in the matter of science and theology. The latter part of the nineteenth century saw science and theology engaged in bitter strife. So pronounced were their disagreements that even so careful a scholar as Mr. Andrew D. White was led into the fatal mistake of naming his elaborate work "A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology." The book, valuable as it is, is not popular to-day. Its name is against it. Men are no longer conceiving of the relation of science and theology as a "warfare." It is an unwelcome thought. Such is the change that has come over the thinking world within a decade of years. The army of scientists, armed with their instruments of investigation, shouted as their battle cry, "Ye shall know the truth." The army of theologians, armed with the traditional dogmas, shouted back the same battle cry, "Ye shall know the truth." Finally, above the din of battle, they heard each other's voice. The useless conflict ceased, and now "the truth has made them free." Science and theology have at last discovered the essential unity of their purpose, and have become united in the pursuit, not of merely scientific truth as such, nor of theological truth as such, but of the "eternal verities" of God.

This union in a common search for truth does not involve the unqualified acceptance on the part of theology of all that science has proposed, nor does it require science to yield to all the teachings of theology. Both theologian and scientist is free to accept or reject from either field. The main feature

of the new position is that each is entitled to make use of the truth discovered by the other and *ought to do so*. The new attitude of both science and religion toward each other has been ably set forth by Professor Otto Pfeleiderer, and I cannot do better than quote his words. "Science will have to remember that its acceptance of the knowableness of the world, if it is not to be without a principle at all, can only be supported on a belief in the creative divine reason in which the agreement of the forms of thinking and being is grounded, and in which consequently the truth of our thinking is guaranteed. It will have to recall the fact that the world of nature or of external sensible phenomena, the investigation of which it pursues with so much zeal and success, is nevertheless only the one side of reality, along with which consists the inner side of our own psychological life as the much more important half of reality; and therefore that an explanation of the world which would ignore this more important side, and which would take the principle of the universe only from the external world of phenomena, would commit the most prodigious abstraction, and, in spite of all fortunate discoveries in detail, would yet at bottom miss the truth on the whole. On the other side, the representatives of religion will also have to remember that they possess the treasure of spiritual truth always only in earthen vessels—that is, in symbolical representations—on which their earthly and temporal origin is but too clearly impressed for them to be able to put forth a permanent claim to infallible divine truth; and consequently that the striving of the thinking mind to distinguish between the eternal truth and its temporal vesture, between the spiritual kernel and its sensible shell, is not an act of sacrilege, but a service which is performed for the sacred cause of truth, and therefore of God." *

Science and philosophy in general have not only a common purpose, but they draw their materials ultimately from a common source. The fundamental principle underlying all

* "Philosophy and Development of Religion," Vol. I., pp. 100-101.

knowledge of the world is that the whole has been thought through in every detail by the Creative Reason. This divine creative reason furnishes the norm by which our human reason must test the truth of its deductions. Facts thus tested form the materials of our reliable knowledge, and one such fact is just as valid as another. A fact brought up from earth, if true, is worth just as much as a fact brought down from heaven. Further, the method of handling these facts must be the same whether they are discovered in the field of science or in the field of philosophy, for there is only one right method and that is the absolutely rational one. The method of our thinking must conform to the same norm as the facts of our thought. We not only "think God's thoughts after him," but we must think them his way, or we shall err.

There is one great fact that is coming out with increasing clearness in the beginning of the twentieth century. That is the fact of the unitary character of all life. Long ago the unity of God was observed even though his manifestations yielded the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the one Godhead. So now, men are coming to see the unity of life, although this life manifests itself in various orders of living things. Although we have been taught to think of three kingdoms in the natural world and another in the spiritual world, the fact is dawning that the Kingdom of Life is one. Nor is this unity to be conceived of as a mere collective unity. Our universe is not an immense bag of sand. The union is not physical; it is not even chemical; it is organic. The world is one in *origin and growth*. Some sort of unity in God's creation has always been recognized. It is this idea of *genetic unity* that constitutes the great new truth which we must read into our conception of the life of the world. As Doctor Newman Smyth observes: "We have learned from a century's science that we are no longer to think of the world and its Maker under Paley's familiar similitude of a watch and its designer; for we now know that things have not been put together in nature as an artisan would assemble the several

parts of a machine; we have now to consider all things around us, and the constellations in the skies, as One of old taught the disciples to consider the lilies, how they grow." * It is true, this "span of life" is too great for us to comprehend it fully. We know not its beginning, we know not its ending. But somewhere in its course, how near the beginning or how near the ending we do not know, we have come into vital connection with it. Almost bewildered we stand thus in the midst of this mighty evolving course of life. We observe with such understanding as our finite minds permit, its nature and development. We see that life in its essential character is extra-material. We see that as it sweeps through this material world it takes hold of the material, organizes it, and uses it for culture purposes. We see it thus organize first a tiny dot of matter into a living cell. We see it further organize the living cells into organisms. Presently we begin to identify the lower forms of animal and vegetable species. Along with the work of organization goes on the development of functions. The higher the organization, the higher the function. At length a degree of organization is reached sufficiently high to allow some of the functions characteristic of life in its pure form, of *spiritual* life we would say. The species having this function has well been described as "made in the image of God." Here the work of organization ceases, there being no higher species. Life has run the gamut of the material world. In man we have the end of the past and the beginning of the future in the history of life. The age-long process of physical development is consummated. What was heretofore God's creature now becomes God's son. No break in the life-line has been made. Henceforth development proceeds in the realm of pure spirit.

Standing thus at the critical point, man shares the nature of both the physical and spiritual orders. With his physical eye he looks back over the past; with his spiritual eye he peers into the future. The backward look yields him his biology;

* "Through Science to Faith," p. 4.

the forward look, his theology. His biology teaches him how he has become what he is. His theology teaches him how he may become what he ought to be. More specifically, biology treats of life as it manifests itself in physical forms, while theology treats of life as it manifests itself in spiritual forms. Biology is a branch of science; theology is a branch of philosophy. The relation of one to the other would not be a vital question, were it not for the fact that biology is a comparatively new science. For eighteen centuries and a half Christian theology had to proceed without its aid. Scientific knowledge of the great field of living nature is one of the many contributions of the nineteenth century. As yet there are great unexplored fields within the scope of the biological sciences, yet the body of knowledge already produced is so great that only a specialist can profess familiarity with the whole field. The last word of the biologist has not yet been spoken. When it is spoken it probably will have largely controverted his first word. The science is yet too young to have its facts fully and finally interpreted. Moreover, the philosophical deductions have been made thus far too exclusively by the scientists themselves, often in ignorance or in disregard of the accumulated wealth of philosophic truth which the world possesses. A recent example of such is Ernst Haeckel's "Riddle of the Universe." The theological philosopher, with the eternal truth of his revealed religion alive in his soul, must go into the field of biology, possess himself of its facts, see the truth they have to teach regarding life, and faithfully and patiently state anew his theological beliefs. Such worthy servants, representing earlier and later interpretations, have been Henry Drummond in England and Newman Smyth in America.

If the science of biology has a revelation for us, the question naturally arises, by what sign shall the revelation come, and what shall be the manner of its coming? Some of the richest truths of the spiritual life have been presented to us in the similitude of facts and phenomena from the world of

living nature. Jesus himself who realized the spiritual significance of life most profoundly, continually pointed to the manifestations of life in the natural world for the instruction of his disciples. Ministers of the gospel find a rich fund of illustration for preaching in the study of nature. But we miss the great lesson of nature if we get nothing more than illustrations from it. We must not be content with drawing parallels. This very idea of parallels has perverted our understanding of the two orders of life. We have been led in our thinking into the habit of placing spiritual life and physical life side by side. They should be placed end to end. *Continuity*, not parallelism, is the key to a proper understanding of the relation of the two. With this new thought-form in which to contemplate the nature of life we may be able to discover some new truth. It is this acquisition of new thought-forms from other fields of thought that constitutes the first great gain to the theological thinker. The "fall of man," for example, a familiar thought-form from the field of theology, loses none of its awful truth when recast in such terms as "retrogression," "degeneration," and "atavism." On the other hand these thought-forms from biology wonderfully illuminate the ancient doctrine. Professor Henry Drummond, while teaching science during the week, was lecturing on religious subjects on Sundays. Gradually his religious thought was being cast in the thought-forms of natural science. Without conscious purpose on his part, laws from the field of physics and biology projected themselves into the field of spiritual experience. The idea of *continuity* was yielding its fruit. Presently he produced his great book on "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." The time-honored truths of theology lost none of their reality for Professor Drummond, but when he saw them in the new thought-form of the essential spiritual unity of the life of the world, they had a new meaning and a vaster importance. As the theologian enters this new field of revelation he should proceed with an open mind and in the spirit of true science. He

should conduct his studies without prejudice, candidly and reverently. As the facts of life revealed in the organic world rise up before him, he will gradually come to a new viewpoint at which both science and theology will merge in a richer understanding of the one universal kingdom of life.

The influence of biological science on dogmatic theology must in the nature of the case be somewhat radical. The established systems must receive a shock somewhat similar to that experienced by theology on the promulgation of the Copernican astronomy. The Copernican astronomy gave the world new thought-forms in which the universe, thereafter, had to be regarded. In a comparatively moderate degree we are again required by modern biology to change our general conception of God's creation. The ruling idea in this new conception is the idea of *life* itself—an idea whose true significance is only seen when we come to interpret the world in terms of life's attributes. Life itself, no biologist has been able to find! His science therefore is not really the science of life but of living matter. The distinction between life itself and the living organism has been clearly drawn. Life transcends the material world. Its whence and whither are not to be defined in space and time. A primary postulate for our theology then is the essential spiritual character of all life whether manifest in mind or in matter.

In the manifestations of life in the organic world we observe a genetic order and a progressive development. In this order and development we observe intelligent direction and moral purpose. We see individuality, beginning far down in the scale of organic life, flowering into personality when at length the spiritual heights of human life are reached. We see the individual appearing first as a protoplasmic cell, then as an organism with powers of adaptation and selection, then as a sentient being with self-consciousness, then as an independent personality with powers of reason, will, and love. Thus, in the natural world, we see life added unto life, becoming ever richer, more abundant, more precious. Shall we

then regard it as anomalous, if in the spiritual world we see the enrichment still going on? Is it not in perfect accord with the universal plan of God as revealed farther down, that a spiritual force such as that represented by Jesus Christ should come in order that in the human scale we "might have life and have it more abundantly"? Is it marvelous that spiritual life from above, the Spirit, the Holy Spirit indeed, should be present to every soul that will receive it, to aid in its ever upward struggle? Nay, all these things were prophesied long ago, not alone in the blessed book of sacred scriptures, but in the blessed book of nature as well. The effect of biology on dogmatic theology is to alter it by enriching it, to magnify its essential truths by confirming them.

But perhaps the greatest service which biology is rendering the cause of religion lies in the fact that it is transferring the emphasis from dogmatic theology to practical theology. "Not doctrine, but life," is a favorite dictum of the present day. Practical Christianity rather than theoretical Christianity is what the age demands. Religion as an active force is permeating society. It is introducing new leaven into the life of the race through agencies hitherto unemployed by the church. Distinctions are being made between mere ecclesiasticism and real Christianity. Form and content are not so closely identified as they once were. New standards of religious life are being established and new tests applied. Less devotion to orthodoxy and greater zeal for righteousness characterize the spirit of the church to-day. This new "time-spirit" in the field of religion has already produced a new and valuable body of Christian literature. Contributions are being added constantly to our theological literature, which in their very titles indicate the new centers of interest. Of course this transfer of interest has been caused in part by the peculiar demands of our time which are intensely practical. It must be acknowledged, however, that the change has been brought about to a great extent by the new inspiration due to the influence of biology. On the one hand, it is seen that the

conception of the universe as a mechanical arrangement, fixed and finished, is untenable, and consequently, that metaphysical systems based on this assumption are no longer intrinsically interesting. On the other hand, the conception of the world as a genetic order having a progressive development, fixes interest on the two vastly more practical themes of *growth* and *expression*, the one yielding the important department of our practical theology known as *Christian nurture*, and the other the equally important department of *Christian worship*.

With respect to Christian nurture, biology speaks in no uncertain terms. One of its principal postulates is the educability of all living matter. In life we have not only the guarantee of growth but also the demand for education. In growth there is always the possibility of variation. In this possibility of variation lies the opportunity for improvement. With the opportunity for improvement comes the demand for education. As we rise in the scale of life the possibility of variation, and with it the opportunity for improvement, increases. Man's chances for bettering his condition are a million-fold greater than are those of an amœba. This is true even of his physical organism, but when we pass up to the new and higher nature of man, which distinguishes him above all other creatures—the spiritual nature, we find a degree of versatility which insures far greater possibilities of variation. So man's opportunity and need for spiritual education is supreme. Nowhere in the long course of life is the demand for education so imperative as in the spiritual life of man.

The conception of the spiritual unity of man does not permit the common idea of two natures, one represented by the mind and another by the heart. Intellect and affections are elements of one and the same soul. The education of these elements should be provided for in a single system. But our educational institutions have not grown up under this view of the matter. At present the state educates the mind and the church educates the heart. So long as we have a separation of church and state this dual arrangement will continue,

and the church must assume responsibility for religious education. Biology has greatly improved our psychology and pedagogy. These in turn are knocking hard at the church door, bidding our religious institutions awake to a realization of their opportunity, and urging them on to duty. The inevitable reforms are already on the way. The principles of modern education are already being applied in many church schools. Progressive courses of study with subject matter suited to the peculiar demands of each period of growth, methods adapted to the various grades, the erection of suitable buildings with improved apparatus, ministers and superintendents trained in religious pedagogy, and training classes for teachers in every church, mark the main lines along which the improvement of religious education must advance.

With respect to the important problem of religious worship the results of biological science should be fully consulted. Running throughout the entire scale of life in the organic world we note the fact of self-expression. There is the persistent tendency in all life to make manifest the secret of its heart. Everywhere nature is trying to explain her own mystery. This tendency to self-expression which we may follow all the way up the long course of life, becomes in its highest form, the innate desire for worship which characterizes the human race. As a spiritual being, man possesses a natural longing for communication with kindred beings. When this communication goes up to the Supreme Being, it becomes true worship.

An important fact to be observed with respect to self-expression in nature is that the outward manifestation is always true to the inner content. There is no cant in the song of the bird, no false modesty in the flower of the hepatica, no hypocrisy in the majesty of the mountain. Nature's suggestion with respect to man's worship is that the outward expression be true to the inner self. In other words, worship, if it be worship at all, must be *genuine*. If we couple with this that other great fact from the book of life, namely the

fact of growth, it becomes conclusive that the soul's self-expression in worship must change in form as the soul itself changes in character. We need not be surprised, then, if a form of worship which we once enjoyed has now lost its reality. Further, nature teaches that if we neglect to adapt the form of worship to the needs of the growing soul, but on the other hand force the soul into the outgrown, inadequate form, the soul will become a spiritual abnormality.

Nature not only teaches that there must be a progressive development in the form of expression in worship, but also points out the direction this development must take. At the lower end of the scale of human life, where there is a maximum of physical, and a minimum of spiritual nature, the form of worship naturally represents the larger element. Among primitive peoples, worship is grossly materialistic. In the highest scale of human life, where the spiritual, and not the physical element, is paramount, worship, on the other hand, is supremely spiritual. He whose spirit has overcome the flesh, who knows himself as a spiritual being, who feels the inward joy of kindred life with the Father, does not find suitable expression for his inner self in material forms. Even language breaks down as a vehicle of the soul's thought and feeling. What devout soul has not felt in the midst of earnest prayer the uselessness of words! It was high spiritual experience that originated the now too formal silence of a Friends' Meeting. The development of worship, to be in keeping with the upward growth of the soul, must proceed toward a maximum of spirituality. With respect to public worship especially, this principle implies that the character of the service should be determined by the inner spiritual life of the congregation rather than by external custom or decree, and that in the same congregation the service should not become unalterably fixed, but should develop with the developing spiritual life of the people.

V.

THE MEANING AND USES OF PAIN.

BY REV. E. R. ESCHBACH, D.D.

We shall consider this subject only as it relates to man, who is the crowning work of creation. The Psalmist says: "He is fearfully and wonderfully made." He has a highly organized nervous system which brings him into relation with the world in which he lives. To this contact with the world we apply the term sensation. All our senses are modifications of the sense of touch and feeling, and through these senses we have pleasure or pain.

Pain is a sensation of discomfort or suffering caused by a want of appropriate stimulus or by the over-excitement of certain nerves. Its presence invariably indicates an abnormal state and serves as a warning to us of a disordered condition.

Too little or too much stimulation will cause pain, while moderate stimulation gives pleasure. Even mental pain falls under this definition of abnormal sensation. In the consciousness of evil, the mind will almost necessarily prick through into the body, which really needs in the way of moral advantage to have this consciousness interpreted to the mind by the body. This is the idea of penalty. It is an evil mind stung with moral pain, which pain is answered, interpreted and made more pungently just by the pains of a disordered body. Words or acts which may not affect a callous mind will produce acute mental distress in a more sensitive mind.

Sensation and pain are thus allied, but essentially distinct conditions. The one is the intensification of the other. Pain and its opposite, pleasure, are the result of the highest form of nervous organization. They cannot be fully defined; they must be felt. The existence of either state ordinarily arises

from the cessation of the other, and the intensity of pain or pleasure depends largely on its contrast with a preceding state. Pleasures are usually associated with beneficial and pain with detrimental experiences.

There is, however, always a mystery in pain and sorrow. We never can understand certainly why it comes to us. There is something that goes before suffering and that is sin. It is amazing that we make so much of the one and so little of the other. Sin is moral evil. It differs from physical pain in that it is the occasion of deeper distress to the offender himself and of greater shame and sorrow to others who may be interested in him.

Neuralgia may appear to be more violent than remorse, but who doubts which is the worse to bear, or who would hesitate in the choice between them?

While the consideration of moral evil does not come within the scope of this paper, yet we are well aware that an immense amount of physical suffering is due to moral evil, and that it is sometimes also the direct fruit of physical pain.

Pain is not accidental; it does not break lawlessly into our lives. No matter what its cause, it is under direction. This is our Father's world, and all things are under His control. Hence we need not fret ourselves over scientific laws, or the inferences men draw from them. God is greater than His own creation, and is never hindered by any physical cause in His ways of working. In its earthly aspect, pain may seem hurtful and even destructive, but in its spiritual outworking it yields blessings.

No pain is without purpose, no sorrow fruitless of abiding joy, no disappointment or loss, but what carries in its issue a gratification unspeakably higher and better. There is a hopeful element in it. The diseased limb that feels no pain is mortified, therefore hopeless. Forgiveness does not remove all kinds of consequences of sin. Job's friends made the mistake of some modern critics, who would make all misfortunes and pain punishment.

The disciples asked the Master, on account of whose sin, whether his own or his parents, that a certain man had been born blind. The answer was that for no one's sin, but for an occasion of good and blessing; for an opportunity of revealing the tenderness and mercy of God, this man had been born blind.

If we were always to greet pain with a reverent welcome in Christ's name, we should be in proper attitude to receive what may be sent us in it. As it is a messenger of God, there is no doubt but that it has come on an errand of love. No matter through whose fault or sin it may have come to us, the pain is ours, and though it may seem unkind and even cruel, there is folded up in it and carried to us by it a treasure of mercy. Nothing of real value in this life comes without pain and cost.

It does not come without God's permission. It is not laden with only hurt and marring for us. It is not an avenging messenger inflicting only punishment, but as an angel of love it comes to chasten us, perhaps to cure us of follies and sins, to lead us nearer to God, and to bring out of us more of the beauty of Christ. While we do not usually think of it in this way, there is no doubt but that it comes to us from God as a trust, and it is to be accepted, used and accounted for by us as such. All life comes to us not for ourselves only, but also for the benefit of others. Not only money is a trust, but life and all its blessings and sufferings are from God and are to be used for our good and the good of others.

Pain comes under this law, and while it has its peculiar meaning for us, it is also to affect other lives. What we learn in the hour of pain we are to communicate to others in their hour of need. In this way we become stewards of the mysteries of God.

There are some blessings which it would seem can be given only in pain and some lessons which can be learned only in suffering. If we would have the reward we must pay the price. If we once get a clear conception of its meaning, we will also know how to endure it for the benefit it brings. This

will keep the heart sweet and unhurt in the midst of the sorest trials and bring the life through the darkest hours shining in transfigured beauty. Then it will have a quickening, purifying and bracing power. Each trial will be as an April shower to a young plant, lending new vigor to the roots, new power to its growth, so that when the sun shines, the buds are seen to expand and bloom. These same buds without rain would have shrivelled and died.

No one can avoid or escape pain. The only right way is to pass through the ordeal with humility and faith, as the Israelites passed through the sea. Then its waves of misery will divide and become as a wall on the right hand and on the left, and we shall be guided safely to the opposite shore. Every throb of pain tells of God's ceaseless and tender regard; every thrust of remorse is God's touch to remind us that we are His; every sigh of regret bears witness of hope which cannot deceive us; every farewell which rends the heart is a pledge of everlasting love. The Lord will swallow up death in victory and He will wipe all tears from all faces, and the rebuke of His people will He take away from off the earth, for the Lord hath spoken it.

Pain, then, is an evidence not of cruelty but rather of benefaction. Some of God's ways are inscrutable, and some of the evils of the world we cannot reconcile with our ideas of righteousness. The difficulty, however, is in our partial and limited knowledge. There are unsolved moral difficulties, that may yet find an explanation that will fully vindicate the honor of God.

There are worse evils than pain. It is often meant to give us insight into the heart of the Eternal Father. Dr. Robert Hall, though a member of the church from his youth, believed that his moral transformation was effected by the terrible discipline of pain which interrupted his ministry and even for a time unhinged his reason.

The supreme success of life is not to escape pain, but to lay hold on righteousness. We live in a moral world, where it is

made pleasant to do what is right and unpleasant to do what is wrong. Nature fences up the way of life, and if any man will break through the hedge, it is good that he should suffer, and none can interfere between the sinner and his penalty.

The capacity of suffering varies greatly. We must meet life in the way in which it comes to us, and it comes not in a series of outward happenings, but colored and shaped by our personalities. We endure pain and lay hold on the truth and growth which it reveals, according to our own strength.

If I go into danger after due warning, I cannot blame earth, air, sea or fire for the injury which I suffer. God performs no miracles to avert threatened injury. The threat is our safeguard. In being inexorable in the laws of nature, God shows His care for the individual. The only condition of safety lies in the fact that the law is inexorable. If I choose to plant a vineyard on the slopes of Mt. Vesuvius, I have myself to blame, if some day it is overwhelmed with burning lava. If I build my house under the shadow of Mt. Pelee, I take the responsibility of forfeiting my life at any time. The instinct of self-preservation is given to every man. If this were taken away the world in which we live would be revolutionized.

As a rule pain occupies a comparatively small portion of each man's life. In very rare cases, indeed, can it be said that pain predominates over pleasure in an individual's life.

Pain is a protest against something that is wrong. It indicates danger. Disease is not a normal thing, and therefore not a permanent thing, and while it lasts pain protests.

At the expense of perhaps some repetition, we venture to name some of the obvious uses of pain.

I. It is necessary as a means of our safety and protection. Our lives depend not only on our sensibility to, but our actual experience of pain. Susceptibility will be of no value without the experience. If hunger were not painful, infants would take no food. If falling down did not hurt, children would not learn to walk upright. Being made sensitive to

pain in certain organs of the body, we are by that means secured against other bodily pains and damages more fatal.

It serves to maintain certain economic functions in the body; closing up valves, stopping secretions, gathering up ulcerations, that will work off and separate disorders that must otherwise be fatal. All such pains are the struggle by which nature seeks to clear and restore itself. It is a self-conserving instinct. The thousand things that men now do to maintain their health and strength have been learned in the school of disease and pain. When susceptibility to pain is temporarily suspended, as in the case of deep sleep, or apoplexy, the subject of this condition is absolutely helpless and bereft of all power of self-protection.

The sense of want has been the origin of our development in knowledge and skill and industry, which have all been called into exercise to satisfy our wants, which when unsatisfied are painful. The whole history of the development of mankind and civilization is the history of human struggle to avoid or remedy or lessen pain, so that on purely physical and temporal grounds it is shown to have been a distinct advantage to man.

II. Pain is the correlative of pleasure. Susceptibility to pleasure likewise involves susceptibility to pain. Every avenue that is open to the one is also open to the other. If we were relieved of sensibility to pain, we should thereby forfeit our capacity for pleasure. The one is often in large measure the contrast to the other. Some of the functions of the body are performed automatically, and are scarcely under our control. The beating of the heart is one of these, and is generally performed without any sensation of pleasure. But should its regular pulsations be interrupted, or disordered by disease, we immediately become conscious of a pleasure in the return of normal pulsations which we never felt before.

In the same way, if the normal action of the lungs be interrupted by painful breathing, the restoration to healthy action is a positive sensation of pleasure entirely new to us. We

cannot compute how much of our actual pleasure is derived from contact with pain.

We also know by experience that almost all our pleasures, if prolonged and not alternated by their absence or positive pain, lose their essence of enjoyment and pall on our taste, and in some instances actually turn to pain. In our present state uninterrupted pleasure is an impossibility. To enjoy pleasure at all, there must be the alternation with sensations more or less painful.

III. Pain rouses opposition. It is no sooner felt than we put forth every effort to be rid of it. When we hear of the suffering of others, the instinct of rebellion against it is so strong that we do all in our power to help the sufferer, and if we cannot remove or alleviate the distress, we try to harden our feelings by a mental effort, or to drive the subject altogether from our thoughts. Nothing seems clearer than that we are constituted to fight pain; where it is unavoidable to weaken its severity, and where incurable to become hardened to its effects.

We owe very much to our battle with it. It has made us restless and inquiring, and our knowledge has in large measure come to us as a result of such inquiry. It has been our intellectual as well as physical and moral schoolmaster. Our inevitable sufferings have been a perpetual stimulus to our minds for knowledge, to our hands for skill, and to our social instincts for civilization. Pain is felt to be an evil thing, therefore we fight against it and try to conquer it. This is necessary to our training and discipline.

IV. Pain leads to the cultivation of our sympathies. If a "fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind," and if "suffering like one touch of nature makes the world of kin," then surely that ordeal is the most exalted consecration by which man can be admitted into the fold of God. It is sadly true that continuous physical comfort has a tendency to close the avenues of our affection and narrow the channels of our heart's love. Those who suffer constantly and intensely are more

brotherly and tender with each other than is supposed. It is only through pain that the power of helpfulness comes. Without it we can hardly learn to discern deeply and to influence strongly and wisely. Pain is the deepest thing we have in our nature, and union through pain has always seemed more real and holier than any other.

Sympathy and all the works by which it ministers begin at the fact of pain. Its appeal calls out of self the warm generous emotions of the heart. Before its withering effects the race grows tender and opens its door to goodness. Where life has had its emergencies and its agonies, it has its highest possibilities.

V. Pain leads to the cultivation of fortitude, endurance and patience. "To bear" and "to dare," these are two of the great lessons which are among the chief moral uses of life. If men can neither be martyrs nor heroes, the highest inspirations of life will be taken from us. Without pain there would be nothing to brave and hence no courage; nothing to bear and hence no patience; nothing to disturb the monotony of physical ease and hence no aspirations. Pleasure itself would lose half its zest. And so it need not surprise us that fresh kinds of suffering arise to take the place of that which has disappeared. The struggle of existence is continually taking on new forms, and has to be fought out with a new generation of foes. As soon as one point of progress is reached, new demands are made on our activity, fresh obstacles stand in our path to stimulate renewed effort.

If our intellectual and moral progress is traceable to the rebellion against pain implanted in our nature, then we must recognize a wisdom higher than our own in its appointment as a condition of humanity. It is true beneficial results do not always flow from pain. Sometimes just the reverse of the virtues we have enumerated are produced. This is an anomaly to be partially explained by the fact that what does man good at one stage of his progress may be fatal at another. We, however, dare not attempt to account for exceptions in the order of Divine Providence.

We seek comfort. The word has its root in that which means to strengthen, and it contains no promise that the distress will be less poignant but that God comforts by giving us power to endure.

Compared with the advantages to be derived from pain, suffering is not an unfair price to pay for it. The Apostle says: "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us."

Again: "Our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh in us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." "God does not willingly afflict nor grieve the children of men."

No pain is wantonly inflicted. It seems necessary to our physical safety and to the control of the untamed forces of our nature.

There is pain which to us seems purposeless, and which no forethought of ours can avert. But avoidable suffering is the result of sin, of a guilty neglect of God's laws for which there is no excuse. It disciplines us, and through it we learn things we never could have known without enduring it.

There is no doubt but that Christians often suffer, that in some way they may honor God. The Master needs witnesses to answer the sneers of the world. Jesus, Himself, "was made perfect through suffering," and thereby was prepared to be a sympathizing friend. The chastening of pain brings out the best fruit of love. It stays the turmoil of worldly life; it introduces serious thought into the house of pleasure; it excites amid the calculations of ambition, and the course of business, a higher thought, and nobler aspirations; it troubles the satisfied conscience, and it pierces the proud or frivolous man as he pursues his way along the path of life. God visits us with pain and thereby makes a breach into the heart He desires to save. We thrust from us heavenly treasures when we refuse to accept what He sends by shutting our hearts against them. They come filled with gifts for the true enrichment of life.

The problem of all true living is not how to miss pain, but to accept it reverently, so as to keep our hearts sweet and our ministry of good and helpfulness ever uninterrupted. This will make us comforters to others.

The photographer carries his picture into a darkened room that he may bring out the features. So likewise the features of spiritual beauty cannot be produced amid the glare of human joy and prosperity. Chastening is always painful, but its purpose is correction and the development of qualities that would otherwise lie dormant.

Sanctified affliction softens the harshness of life; it tames the wildness of nature; it consumes the dross of selfishness and worldliness; it humbles pride; it tempers ambition; it shows us the evil of our hearts; it reveals our faults and blemishes, and makes us aware of spiritual danger. In this way we are prepared for heavenly blessings.

Suffering is wrought into the very fiber of growth. Its reality is one of the great facts in the Christian faith. It refuses to dissolve the fact of sin into an unnatural process of growth. It is not a fiction of the feelings. It is wrought into the spirit of a man, that it may leave there its purification, its tenderness, its clearer and holier vision. The cup of pain is held to every lip, but only they that drink it reverently are strengthened thereby, and its secret sweetness is distilled through the darkest hour of the pilgrimage.

Indeed, it is difficult to see how the highest type of virtues could be developed without pain. I can conceive it possible that we might have justice, truthfulness, sobriety, chastity, industry and fidelity without it. But how would it be possible to have the virtues of fortitude, courage, patience, compassion, sympathy and heroic self-sacrifice? Human suffering calls these into being.

Pain is God's messenger sent to bring us home when we wander far from Him; it is His watchman calling in mercy to waken our souls lest they sleep the sleep of death.

"Before I was afflicted I went astray, but now have I kept

Thy law," is the experience not only of the Psalmist, but of millions of God's children ever since. Wrapped in our own gratification, having no wants nor longings, our spirits would never have risen above the clods and mire of the earth; our hearts would never have longed for a peace and rest which the world cannot give. For the best discipline of our souls, pain is a necessity. Our relation to God, our conscious leaning upon Him, and our resignation to His wise appointments would lose their spiritual value if it were henceforth excluded.

One of the rewards of suffering is the acquisition of power to light the way of other sufferers. It is worth the price of pain to receive the power to be a true helper to those who are in trouble. To be enabled to bind up the broken-hearted is the most divine of all endowments. The best and holiest examples of piety have been tried and finished in the crucible of suffering.

VI.

CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENCE.

BY REV. SAMUEL Z. BEAM, D.D.

There is nothing in science which is contradictory to Christianity and nothing in Christianity that is contradictory to science.

Rightly understood they are mutually helpful because harmonious in their conclusions. Whenever theologians and scientists recognize the truth of these propositions, the harmony between nature and revelation will assert itself, and the antagonisms hitherto apparently existing will disappear. There never has been any substantial reason for the existence of a conflict between the adherents of science and the defenders of religion. Whatever antagonism has manifested itself in the past was subjective and not objective. The belligerents have unhappily transferred their subjective ideas and feelings to the objective realities of spiritual and material things. In their shortsightedness and misapprehension of the truths revealed in nature and in grace, they have seen them in distorted forms; and, accordingly, in many instances, they have spoken or written unadvisedly, and wrought mischief and injury to the cause they sought to defend. Hence the raging and bitter controversies, which, in the past, have brought discredit both to science and to religion. And while Christianity and science have continued to advance with rapid strides for the last century, there are strong reasons for the belief that an exercise of charity and moderation, among their advocates, would have contributed largely to a better understanding, and their mutual and harmonious influence for good would have been increased many fold. But poor human nature sometimes seems to value its ignorance, ambition and

pride more highly than the truth itself. We seem to study nature, on the one hand, and the Bible on the other, not so much, apparently, to apprehend the truth, as to prove a preconceived theory; and prejudice runs away with reason. Anything, therefore, that contradicts our theory is repudiated and brushed aside, as of no value, or as positively evil. It is unpleasant, if not exasperatingly repugnant, to our pride of learning or to our feelings of devotion, when a cherished opinion or article of faith is rudely overturned. And it is especially distasteful if the truth was discovered and promulgated first in the ranks of the "opposition." Accordingly the study of the Bible and the study of the book of nature, alike, result in sustaining prejudice and misconception.

It is easy to fall into error and hard to get out of it. But much may be learned from others, whose standpoint is different from our own; and the humility of wisdom will help us to accept the truth from any source.

Theologians and scientists, of course, occupy different fields of observation, and each ought to be willing to give and take anything helpful to the interests of both. In this way both interests may be promoted. The theologian has God and eternity, man and his destiny, for the subjects of study chiefly, but may learn much from a contemplation of nature and its laws. But he is largely dependent on divine authority for his knowledge. He must, therefore, look to divine revelation as the source of his authority on these momentous themes. He must, indeed, exercise his intellectual faculties and accord to them their rightful place and authority, otherwise his knowledge would be extremely limited, if not entirely *nil*. The Holy Scriptures, as he believes, contain the written record of God's revelation, and demand his acceptance of what they teach as being divinely inspired, and, therefore, worthy of his confidence and faith. A right understanding of their teaching depends on the guidance of the Holy Spirit by whom they claim to be inspired. Thus, the prophets appeal for their authority to a "Thus saith the Lord"; and the apostles claim

them to be inspired of God. St. Paul declares that "no man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit." Accordingly, a mere intellectual apprehension of their teaching is inadequate to a saving knowledge of the truth. It must be supplemented by *faith*, which proceeds from the Holy Spirit, or it is simply *rationalism*.

The mystery of Godliness, revealed in Jesus Christ, could never have been discovered by any process of human reasoning, nor can it be accepted in its saving power, save by the exercise of faith. The Spirit takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us, and so guides us into all truth.

This appears to be the stumbling block of the scientist, who refuses to *believe* anything which he cannot verify with his crucible and microscope.

The theologian believes further that the church is a divine institution, inspired also by the Holy Spirit, and is entitled to some authority in the interpretation of the Scriptures. As Christ's witness and representative among men, she is clothed with authority to preach, administer the sacraments, and exercise discipline. From the written word she formulates her creed for the preservation of unity of faith among the children of God. To the theologian there appears to be a necessity for creed and confession, in order that those professing and calling themselves Christians may be bound together by a common faith, and participate in a common salvation. This appears to have been fully demonstrated in the onward progress of her history, during which she has found it necessary to defend the truth against heresy and schism, which arose in innumerable forms to mar her beauty and at times to threaten her existence.

He believes, again, that in her history and conflicts, Christ's presence has been revealed to save her from destruction, and to enable her to resist her enemies so successfully that the gates of Hades could not prevail against her. Against persecution and ridicule, and literary antagonism she has maintained the faith once delivered to the saints, and no earthly

or diabolical power has been able to hinder her onward progress in history and her civilizing influence as the bearer of salvation to a lost world. And, accordingly, amid the vicissitudes and crises of history the church has always stood forth with her Creed and Confession as "the pillar and ground of the truth," and she still survives as its great conservator, amid the vagaries and fancies of a free-thinking and free-living age.

The modern outcry against creeds and confessions is no more than the expression of a morbid subjectivism, and the demand for freedom of thought, so strenuously insisted on, is often a plea for personal licentiousness, over against authority of all kinds, and, in the hands of infidel thinkers, is made an anarchical cudgel with which to slay the truth. Hence the Church in self-defense must have her Creed and Confession, even as the scientist must have his theory and hypothesis, for a working basis.

Again, the theologian, true to his spiritual instinct, must maintain the integrity and authority of the Bible against all gainsayers. For when its integrity is destroyed and its authority taken away, his foundation becomes insecure and liable to be swept away by any storm of opposition that may arise against it. Any system of investigation, therefore, which tends toward the weakening of faith in the Holy Scriptures as a divine revelation, becomes a playing into the hands of its enemies. And though some may say, for the quieting of his fears, "You have the living Christ," he still realizes that his knowledge of Christ, after all, as a historical person is wholly derived from the Bible. And he cannot forget or ignore his dependence on the Holy Spirit as a guide in its interpretation, since no one can understand the mind of the Spirit unless guided by His inspiration. He is bound, also, by his loyalty to Christ to maintain the integrity of the Church, as the body of Christ, and to guard the purity of her creed against all antagonists. Feeling this responsibility, he

naturally is jealous of any attempt to undermine the Bible or to overthrow the Church.

But sometimes, in his anxiety to maintain the truth, or what he believes to be the truth, he resents the developments of scientific investigation, which appear to him to contradict his views of the truth, and, in his efforts to defend a possibly untenable interpretation, he goes astray, and, perhaps, unconsciously, but really falls over to the side of the enemy. This we believe is true of those who exalt Jesus in one breath and discredit His Church in the next. To divorce Jesus from His Church is disloyalty to Jesus. We often hear and often read the war cry, "Back to Christ," as if His Church had actually wandered away from Him! This watchword appears to mean that Jesus, apart from His Church, is to be followed as the *model man*. His incarnation, sufferings, death, resurrection and exaltation, as well as His teaching of heavenly truth, all seem to be side-tracked in the interest of His sociological teachings which are emphasized as supreme, referring mainly, if not wholly, to the present life. Thus He is made a sort of Epicurus, teaching men how to make the most of and to enjoy the life that now is. The aim seems to be to elevate society, to make the poor rich, to contribute to present pleasure and gratification, and, in this materialistic way, to follow Christ. Such, in some quarters, is taught for a true interpretation of the aim and purpose of Jesus, and the pulpit and the press alike are used to advocate this idea of Christ and Christianity. This is a sort of bread-butter Christianity, which has no use for the church, because it emphasizes the spiritual and eternal interests of men, and demands submission to a moral code which condemns worldly mindedness and immoral practices. If this idea of Christianity were correct, it would not be much better than the systems of Confucius, Laotze, Zoroaster and Buddha, who would then rank with Jesus as inspired men. And the heretofore supposed inspiration of biblical writers, like many of the ancient worthies named therein, would become a myth.

All this, of course, the sound theologian repels as neither scientific nor Christian; and all Christians and scientists might unite in repudiating it as discreditable both to science and religion.

Jesus taught infinitely more and better than such a system. He claimed not only to be a moral leader, but also a *Saviour from sin*. He never wearied in pointing men away from the beggarly elements of this world, and in directing His hearers to God and heaven and eternal life. To Him these constituted the aim, and the supreme purpose of human existence. And so He insisted on faith in God as our Father, and on the cultivation of love to God and men, supplemented by a life of holiness. To this end He assured His disciples that the Holy Spirit would be given them, as their Advocate and Helper, and that, after bringing them into life union with Himself, as the source of salvation, He would guide them into all truth. Then, in addition to the heavenly doctrines He taught, and the miraculous works He did, to manifest the love of God to men He laid down His life as a voluntary sacrifice that men might be thereby reconciled to God. He rose again from the dead that they might be justified or saved by His life.

With these facts before us concerning Jesus and His place in history and Christianity, the one-sided and earthly-minded caricature of Him noticed above is manifestly out of all harmony with the truth, and may be dismissed as unworthy of further notice.

More scientific, and far more worthy of notice, is the higher criticism, which, by its radical and sweeping blows, aimed at tradition and previous interpretations of Holy Scripture, has provoked a good deal of adverse comment and animadversion, as well as elicited much favorable discussion and praise. And, we think, there are good reasons for both the adverse and favorable comment. As we understand it, the higher criticism is an effort to discover the date, the authorship and the manner of their composition of the books of the Bible.

This effort is characterized by a careful study and a diligent comparison of the several books, and a thorough examination of their contents. It inquires whether they are original in their present form, whether much of their contents were handed down by tradition or whether they were compiled from such tradition, and from documents handed down from an earlier age. By such efforts it seeks to bring us to a knowledge of the true, genuine origin of the books of the Bible, of its authors and of the approximate dates at which they were written or compiled. In the interest of such knowledge we are required, by at least some of the eminent critics, to ignore all traditions of the past, to place ourselves in the position of learners, without faith or unbelief, without prejudice or prepossession, and, with open minds, like *tabulæ rasæ*, proceed to the investigation, and then accept and record whatever we discover. In this way it is proposed to give us a Bible pure and simple as it came from its original authors, freed from superstition and from the errors of uncritical and indiscriminating tradition. These statements, we think, are fair.

If, now, one is prompted to advance the interest of pure literary science, without regard to morals or religion, the above canon of inquiry might be admissible, but from the antiquated standpoint of a believing inquirer we cannot gracefully accept it. We are not inimical to higher criticism. We in fact believe in it. But this requirement, together with some of the results of historical criticism, arouses our antagonism. We cannot keep it down. Whatever such research can discover and give us concerning the composition, the compilation and the authorship of the books of the Bible, we are thankfully willing to receive. Let us have all the light obtainable. But when you attempt in a rationalistic way to rule out of the canon, what, from the standpoint of faith, is fundamental, and therefore essential, to a divine record, or a divine revelation, we must, for the present, withhold our assent.

It concerns us little whether Moses wrote the whole of the Pentateuch in its present form or not. Probably he did not.

But it concerns us a great deal whether Moses was a real person, and a God-appointed leader and lawgiver for the Hebrew race; and whether his laws were of his own invention, or whether he received them directly from God, as the record certainly declares. If throughout the Old Testament the supernatural and supersensual are to be eliminated; and if the Bible statements concerning miraculous events are to be relegated to the realm of myth and legend, we are not prepared to accept the conclusions. We may well admit that many historical and miraculous occurrences therein recorded cannot be made to square with mere logical reasoning. They may seem contrary to a supposed universal experience. But to deny or explain them away on that account is equivalent to saying that God is not superior to the laws of nature, or that He cannot use them in an extraordinary way for His own wise and righteous purposes.

If we are asked to rule out the creation story as no revelation from God, but as a legend, the fall of man as a canard, Abraham as no historical personage, but only the mythical ideal of the Hebrew ancestry, the destruction of Sodom as a fiction, and the story of Jonah as a fable, we must demur. We may accept the theory of an Isaiah and a deutero-Isaiah; of a Zechariah and a deutero-Zechariah, and the post-exilic date of many of the Psalms, though contrary to tradition and to our former belief; but when the predictive character of the old prophecies is set down as evidence of a more or less successful guess work; and when the heretofore supposed Messianic predictions are denied any direct or immediate reference to the Christ and His mission; and when the miraculous and supernatural conception and birth of Jesus is credited to a legend of a later date, which somehow crept into the New Testament, we wonder what is left for us in the Bible to believe, or accept, as the ground of salvation and eternal life.

Again, when Jesus is held up merely as a moral leader, whom it is profitable to follow, and we are told that His so-called atonement is in no sense a sacrifice for sin and does

not secure our forgiveness from God, but only works a moral influence, inciting us to love God and turn to righteousness, we feel that the simple statements of the Bible are tortured out of all semblance to what they teach and mean for the sick soul, and he is left in helplessness and despair. Such interpretations of the Bible seem to us to be out of all harmony with science or logic or the ordinary common sense of intelligent readers.

Can it be possible that all the heroes of faith during the course of nineteen hundred years of Christian history, and whose lives have been a benison and an honor to humanity misapprehended and falsified the religion of Jesus, and died in ignorance of the Bible and its real teaching? Or can it be that God's revelation has been so clouded in obscurity, by the simple language in which it is recorded, that it could not be rightly understood till a race of wise men could arise, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, to extract the truth from its pages and enlighten His benighted people?

Tradition, doubtless, is at fault in many particulars, and so far ought to be corrected. Historical research and critical judgment are needful to sift the wheat from the chaff. But it seems hardly in accord with just historical criticism to set aside, with a magisterial wave of the hand, the doctrine of divine inspiration, and thereby destroy the infallibility of the Bible, in which the Church has believed so long, and which the Bible claims for itself as the ground of its authority.

Its claim to infallibility, in *spiritual concerns*, seems to us not to be a subject of criticism, and we must be permitted to receive the dictum of the *destructive* critic with some degree of reserve. His reasoning on such a theme may be as fallible as that of the authors of tradition. And it does not strengthen his theory to claim that all respectable students of the Bible accept it as true. In fact, some very respectable students, who are not governed by prejudice, or are not in bondage to tradition, pointedly deny the correctness of his claims.

If the so-called miracles and supernatural interventions re-

corded in the Bible are only imaginary, we are quite unable to see how the "historical Christ," concerning whose life and works they are written, can be of much avail. To say that whatever we have lost by such lowering of biblical authority is more than compensated by "coming back to Christ" does not satisfy our faith or reason. A historical Christ, much of whose history is supposed to be mythical, and especially that part of it which gives it supreme value, is hardly substantial enough to rely on in matters of vital and supreme concern. Such a Christ must fall in the ruins of the inspiration, and in the overthrow of the infallibility of the Bible, on which we are dependent for a knowledge of His original history.

It appears clear to us that the Bible is infallible *on spiritual concerns*, and that it does contain a genuine revelation from God, whatever may have been the manner or method of its communication to the writers, or the exact time of its record.

Of course, what is said above regards only the rationalistic and apparently unbelieving conclusions of the *destructive critic*.

The higher criticism is represented also by a different order of men, whose criticism is ruled and guided by the *principle of faith*; men who are not frightened by the supersensual, the supernatural or the miraculous, which they find playing so conspicuous a part in the records of divine revelation. These may be denominated "*constructive critics*," whose most important service is to build up, rather than to tear down. They are governed in their researches by the desire to put away superstition, and to deliver the Bible from what seem to them the misconceptions of good people in regard to its place and authority in the Christian system. Such leaders one need not be afraid to follow, notwithstanding they sometimes shock us by knocking away the props which temporarily sustained our untenable though cherished opinions. It is easy to see, therefore, that the higher critic has a legitimate work to do, and though in his search for truth he makes mistakes, he is ever ready to correct them. We may sincerely wish him Godspeed

in his efforts to clarify the atmosphere of divine truth, so as to make it intelligible to the earnest seeker after salvation in Jesus Christ.

The scientist may and often does carry on his researches independently of religious convictions, and is not, necessarily for his particular purpose, concerned about the teaching of the Bible, or even the existence of God. His object is the study of nature, the starry heavens and the earth on which we dwell. He seeks to discover the laws of matter, partly to promote knowledge and partly to teach the artisan how to advance the material and commercial interests of men, by means of the forces inherent in matter, which, by his knowledge of its laws, he is able to control and turn to account for the benefit of mankind. He also extends his investigations to the laws of vegetable and animal life, in their relations to each other, and especially in relation to human life and its physical well being. He recognizes in man's physical and intellectual being the highest development of nature. He acquires a knowledge of these things by observation and experiment with crucible and magnifying glass. As long as he confines his investigations to this legitimate sphere, his methods and instruments are reliable, and, in general, his discoveries may be accepted as true. But when he transcends the sphere of matter and extends his empirical tests to the sphere of spiritual existence they fail him. God and eternity, man and his destiny, are not subjects of that kind of empiricism which depends upon the manipulation of matter. The supersensual, the supernatural and the spiritual cannot be demonstrated by chemical analysis or mathematical calculation. Whenever, therefore, the scientist attempts to study religion in this empirical fashion he either discovers the inadequacy of his methods or falls into unbelief. The Bible is to be studied and judged, not as a book on natural science, but as a book which relates to spiritual things, and regards the higher spiritual concerns of man in his relation to God and eternity. Hence he must bring to his aid something related to a higher order of existence than that

which has occupied his attention. He must exercise *faith*, which is the highest reason, or grovel in his servility to matter. A mind enslaved by its devotion to what may be seen and heard and handled is poorly equipped for the study and apprehension of spiritual truth, simply because it neglects the first principles of religion. Hence the conflict, not between science and religion, but between the scientist and the theologian. "The natural man receiveth not the things that be of God." He either denies the existence of God as an allwise and intelligent Creator or hides his atheism under the mask of agnosticism, which is practically the same thing. He finds that he cannot examine a spirit with his microscope, or dissolve it in his crucible, or compound it with a gas or fluid, and so he denies its existence, or, possibly, treats it as an attenuated form of matter, too subtle for manipulation.

Viewing the Bible and its teaching from this materialistic standpoint, it appears incredible to him, and he is too ready to contradict it because he cannot verify its statements by the application of his scientific methods. And so science appears in the attitude of antagonism towards religion.

The Christian, on the other hand, is as perfectly conscious of his spiritual life as he is cognizant of the materials of which his body is formed. And he believes in the divinity of our holy religion, as firmly as he believes that oxygen and hydrogen combine in the proportion of one to two to form water; and with as good reason. It is easy to see, therefore, that the denial of the scientist will provoke his opposition. And, unfortunately, the Christian, in his jealousy for his faith, resents the attack, becomes prejudiced against science as an enemy of Christianity, and the resulting controversy seems to array science and religion against each other as if they were natural enemies. That this is not the case, however, is evident from the fact that many of the most eminent scientists are devout Christians, and are not conscious of any conflict whatever between their religion and their science. But, on the contrary, they see in science a handmaid of religion, and so Chris-

tianity and science, acting in harmony, work together for the promotion of human happiness, both in this world and in the world to come.

And there is a good reason for this harmonious activity. For, notwithstanding the inability of the unbelieving scientist to accept the teaching of the Bible, because he cannot verify it by his scientific methods, it is nevertheless true that science itself *depends on faith* for its advancement as much as religion does. Many of the most important discoveries of science have been obtained *through faith*.

Thus, when a scientist observes a certain phenomenon for which he is unable to account, he invents a hypothesis and forms a theory, and then proceeds to test the theory by experiment. If his experiment sustains his theory, he for the present *believes* that it is true, albeit another experiment, which he has not tried, may contradict his theory. By his method of induction he gathers a number of facts of like nature, and then putting them together, by analogy he arrives at a general principle. His conclusions have a degree of force in proportion to the number of facts or particular things he has observed. And yet, since he cannot gather all the facts in a given case of induction, he is never absolutely certain that his conclusions are correct. For, if he could observe a sufficient number of particulars, he might find, ultimately, that his generalization was wrong. In justification of this statement, some of the most noted scientists of modern times might be quoted. They unhesitatingly declare that they can, by induction, arrive at a greater or less degree of probability only, because it is impossible to gather all the parts of a given whole.

In consequence of such limitation in experiments, the so-called verified truths of science are after all only *objects of faith*. The scientist *believes* certain things are true, simply because he finds by experiment that a limited number of facts indicate that they may be true. Without entering into any elaborate discussion of the question, we think the above state-

ments justify us in the conclusion that inductive proof, after all, is only approximate. And in this respect, therefore, the scientist's ground of certainty is no more substantial than that of the believer in religious truth. In fact, science itself has demonstrated over and over again that its conclusions are not fixed or absolute. What was proven at one time and accepted as true, by the verification of experiment was afterwards overthrown by a new induction, or series of experiments. And the history of science in all its branches is but the record of frequently recurring changes, which simply prove the unreliable character of all human experiments. This is not said to discredit science in any way, but only to show the unbelieving scientist that his verifications are no more reliable in the interpretation of nature than those of the theologian in the interpretation of the Bible, or in the support of religion.

When the scientist attempts to account for the origin of nature, or of life, he finds himself floundering in a sea of uncertainty and doubt, without chart or compass to guide him to the desired haven. The mystery of existence is a Gordian knot which he cannot untie.

But at this point religion comes to the rescue, and declares (as a working hypothesis if you choose) the existence of God. An intelligent, all-wise, almighty and loving Father is held up as the Author of all existence. If we accept the existence of God as a working hypothesis, one can easily see how we can account for all existence, for the origin of life, the spiritual nature and moral instincts of mankind, and for our aspiration after a higher and better life in this world and eternal life in the world to come. Supposing it only to be a hypothesis, yet the existence of God is a means by which we can account for many mysteries for which, otherwise, there is absolutely no explanation.

Christianity and its influence on individual men, and its civilizing, humanizing power upon the peoples where it prevails, can only be explained on the supposition of its divine origin and supernatural authority. The spiritual change wit-

nessed in myriads of individuals through the Gospel and the means of grace is a phenomenon absolutely unexplainable, excepting on the theory of some intelligent spiritual power working upon the mind and soul with such moral force as to transform the worst of sinners into saints. And the ever-growing acknowledgment of human brotherhood, founded on the belief in the Fatherhood of God, and the consequent physical, moral and spiritual improvement of the race, can no more be attributed to any inherent quality of human nature than that the icebergs of the frigid zones are the source of light and heat to the other portions of the earth. In fact, the history of the race betrays an inherent tendency towards deterioration and moral decay. As illustrations of these truths we need only to refer to the most highly civilized nations of antiquity, whose descendants are now the most barbarous and degraded.

From facts like these we may reasonably infer the existence and the love and mercy of an all-wise and almighty God, who exercises an influence for good. And they furnish corroborative testimony of what the Bible offers as a divine revelation. We may, therefore, well ask here: "What stronger proofs can science furnish for the existence of many of its most important truths?"

Who, for instance, can verify the atomic theory? It has been accepted by scientists in all the ages since it was first proposed. But who ever saw an atom? By what test has its existence been verified? Who, again, ever handed a molecule? Yet all scientists *believe* in them, and talk about them, as if they regard them as veritable undeniable facts. And why? Because by the hypothesis of their existence the behavior of matter under manipulation can be accounted for. They offer help in the explanation of chemical analysis and synthesis. And, accordingly, the scientist *believes* in them, though they exist only in the supersensual realm of ideas. And so it appears that the scientist, after all, must work on

the principle of *faith* if he is to accomplish anything even in the sphere of material phenomena.

Again, the hypothesis that all space is filled with a subtle substance called ether furnishes another evidence of scientific faith. And, as far as we can see, his foundation is no more substantial than that on which the Christian rests his faith in God and in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the world. No man ever saw, heard, tasted, smelled or handled ether. It lies beyond the reach of his senses and its domain is, therefore, supersensual, and wholly above the natural powers of perception. But for the purposes of scientific investigation ether seems to furnish a medium filling all space, through which alone satisfactory explanations can be given of certain phenomena. Light, for example, must have a medium, through which its illuminating waves or vibrations may be communicated, and, in the absence of any other satisfactory explanation, the hypothesis of a universal ether was proposed. The theory of its existence is also proposed as an explanation for the transmission of radiant heat, molecular actions, magnetic and electric attractions and repulsions, etc. Now all scientists *believe* in this subtle substance, though its existence has never been verified by observation, and all admit that observation in this instance is impossible.

Again, we may observe, by way of further proving the existence and necessity of *scientific faith*, that the doctrine of evolution demands a faith fully as strong as any proposition of religion requires. The universal verdict of scientists is that the theory of evolution is an "undemonstrated hypothesis," and that it serves only as a working basis, as a means of solving other problems, which, otherwise, might remain in mysterious obscurity. But the theory has never been verified. The greatest of scientists and philosophers declare that it cannot be verified. The missing links in the chain of evidence, if they ever existed, are lost beyond recovery, so that they have given up all hope of ever demonstrating scientifically the doc-

trine of evolution. And yet nearly all students of natural sciences *believe in it*.

Without specifically naming other theories in the domain of science which *demand the exercise of faith* in unverified and unverifiable hypotheses, we simply wish to ask why any honest scientist should take offence at a principle *in religion*, which is indispensable in science, and on which every scientist is constantly working? In fact, both science and religion have their common source in God, and, as far as we can see, there is no reason for antagonism or controversy. Let men be consistent and study both with a sympathetic faith, and the truth of each will authenticate itself to their reason. Nature and revelation are both books of God, and, as such, demand and are worthy of the most reverent and serious study of every intelligent and honest man.

VII.

EXTENT OF THE IDEA OF HEREDITY.

BY REV. J. E. HARTMAN.

How far effective for ethical ends the idea of heredity proved itself to be in nations and civilizations other than Israel is a question at once interesting and impossible. It is impossible for several reasons; first, because information is not abundant in the historic records of other peoples; and second, because Israel is the only people apparently that brought the idea in its completeness along with it out of the shadows of the prehistoric world. And yet the interest centering in the question is sufficient apology for making diligent quest for the idea outside of Israel, and finding it there, comparing it faithfully with its higher expression in Israel, noting the differences and attempting to account adequately for the inconsistency.

It is the habit of some modern historians of religion to trace the beginnings of religious conceptions as far back as the clan-state of society. And this would be right except that, in so doing, there seem to be present to mind numerous clans existing side by side, helping, limiting or opposing one another. This is looking back to diversity for the source of a common possession of all the peoples in all time. This is hardly natural. Origins ought to be sought in unity. Whether we are inclined to accept the narrative of Genesis relative to human origin or not, it seems a necessity to think that at the beginning there was only one family, one clan, a summit-point of a vast receding inferiority beneath—a place of departure from which subsequent peculiarities take their rise.

Looking at the question in this light it is evident that, trac-

ing the history of Israel, or Babylon, or Egypt—of Semite or Aryan—backward, we are following along converging pathways. The roots of all peoples strike down into one subsoil. Somewhere in that simple condition the race awoke to an idea of heredity. But from that point upward with the branching civilizations the idea was carried forth, either in atrophied form, in distortion or in development. So far as we can determine, it was in general the Semites who bore forth a developing idea; and in particular it was the children of Israel. The other nations had the idea too, doubtless; but with them it had little to do with religion, and was made rather an explanation of the past than a determination of the future. It may seem to be the same thing when Cicero says: "If the father of Saturn be a god, so must Saturn also be one"; and when the prophet cries that the nature of the fathers shall be that of the sons. But it is not the same. Cicero is walking backward, searching among the ruins of the past. The prophet is peering far forth into the possibilities of the future. The one is pause; the other is progress. The one is history; the other is prophesy. The one is fate; for what hand is deft enough, what arm is strong enough to reach back into the past and reconstruct the characters, the deeds and the misdeeds of those that have long since closed the doors of the tomb behind them, as they sent forth the influence of their natures and doings to mar or to make the days that should come? History is adamant. But the other is possibility. The future is not yet made. It is more plastic than the air. The present determines it. Cicero stands and cries into the void and unanswering vaults of the dead. The prophet speaks to the living. This is a very great difference. It is the gulf-distinction between the idea of Israel and that of the other ancient peoples.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that all the nations of antiquity did not look into the future with some sort of hope, except the Hebrews; or on the other hand, that the Jews never cast their eyes backward into the past. "The head

which does not turn toward the horizons of the past, contains neither thought nor love." We shall see, however, that the idea was modified rather by the nature of the forward look of all these peoples than by the fact or the lack of such a look. That the manner in which the future was regarded depended upon certain causes which could easily be determined is not to be contradicted. For it is evident that environment, racial dispositions and national experiences upon which rested the differing religious conceptions—all these things would naturally tend to widely divergent philosophies of the past and prophesies of the future.

Outside of Israel the idea of heredity in antiquity has but little ethical value. It is sometimes recognized; but to them that regard it at all, it is a hieroglyphic scratch on the face of nature which may or may not have any meaning beyond its mere existence; and in any case it expresses no thought that is capable of breathing an inspiration.

Originally the idea had a vital relation with religion. Israel's law insisted upon maintaining that relation through all her history. Other civilizations forgot that relation. They held fast to religion; in some sense they also held fast to the idea. But once the latter had ceased to depend upon the authority and life of the former, it dwindled in importance until it came to be of no value whatever for the amelioration of its constituency. Had it remained sacred it would have continued potent. If there were no other difference between the thought and life of Israel and those of her neighbors than this expression of a religious conception of heredity, one would still hold the key to the solution of the vast differences in religious accomplishments of the former, with her magnificent contribution of spiritual insight and power to the growing creation, as opposed to the meager results of far more pretentious systems. There are many wonders in the code of Moses; but the second commandment is the miracle of law. Until in the code of Hammurabi, or in the hieroglyphs of Egypt, or in the undiscovered tablets of forgotten generations buried

far beneath the débris of the centuries, men shall unearth the second commandment, Israel and her law will stand incomparably above the reach and touch of the ambitions of any people that ever lived. And in case it should happen to be thus discovered, it will remain true that other peoples proved faithless to it and failed; that Israel, at least remembered it and succeeded, thus making the truth expressed in the command its own vindication in the light of history.

An old incantation of Babylon recognizes some sort of an idea of heredity. "Thou art a bird, offspring of (some god); I am a man, offspring of (some god)" (cf. Lev. XIV: 53). The thoughts of incantations contain little food for spiritual growth. They are the degenerate form of prayers that at one time were, no doubt, the natural outgoings of sincere hearts. Yet it is possible in this Babylonian fragment to discover what must formerly have been an ascription of a special nature to the bird by defining its descent from a god; also a similar claim for the speaker for the same reason.

The mythic heroes of ancient Greece, gaining their peculiar powers from the fact that they were sons of gods, or of mixed descent from gods and men, are also recognitions of the idea of heredity. They are attempts to explain the result by the source.

Among the Egyptians it was a creed that the king is a child of the god. He was worshipped by his subjects, and he even worshipped himself. It was an important part of his duty to erect a temple to the god whose son he was believed to be.

Now these are illustrations of mere dreams—the mystical thoughts of those old religions that touched life scarcely at all, and removed not, nor relieved whatever, the pressure of life's practical problems. With the Semites it was a familiar faith that all humanity sprang from divine sources; but this faith was so familiar that its fascinations had lost lustre. Imagination cared not to exert itself in elaborating fancies about the beginnings. There were destinies about which to be con-

cerned. If men came from gods, so much greater the reason for men to be godlike.

Yet, other peoples, too, had a more human thought of heredity. A hymn to Istar approaches very near to the expression of Psalm LI: 5: "Since the days of my childhood I have been chained fast to evil." It is doubtful whether "evil" here stands for unrighteousness; it more probably means adversity. Still, the devotee doubtless was conscious of some significance in the fact that such an evil was present to him even from the beginning. The Zend Avesta (Chap. XII) treats of the uncleanness which comes to a family from the death of one of its members, and modes of purification are minutely defined. This indicates the notion of family-unity which is an essential condition for a practical idea of heredity. Among the Greeks, Aristotle says: "Drunken women bring forth children like unto themselves"; and Plutarch: "One drunkard begets another." Illustrations of the same character might easily be multiplied. We are led back to the point from which we started. It is true, then, that the idea of heredity is almost, if not entirely, universal, but by no means uniform either in character or in power. And whilst among the Semites, heredity is regarded, more or less, as a divine instrument for the working of righteousness, hence is a religious fact above all else, and among other peoples it is considered largely apart from religion, it will be found on careful study that it is the difference of religious conceptions that makes the difference in these various ideas of heredity. And particularly is it the differing notions about futurity that so immensely modify the idea.

The children of Israel furnish us, so far as has yet been learned, the first instance of Monotheism. In the midst of the enthusiasms of Nature-worship, Ancestor religion, Fetichism, we see this strange phenomenon—a people devoted to the worship of one God. The very logic of Polytheistic faiths would lead away from any constant thought of heredity. The many gods coexisting are at perpetual war; sometimes one is

victor, again another. The storm-god triumphs over the sun-god and is supreme; again the sun-god smites anew and snatches back his scepter. The relations of this celestial pantheon to men are, at most, only casual, we may say, only playful. The gods are interested in men because men are amusing. Their supernatural tempers are as fitful as the moods of an April morning. Not established themselves either in character or in position, it could not be supposed that they, or any one of them, could establish a program for humanity.

And in ancestor worship the aspect is little changed. The race has numerous fathers. The prearrangements for his progeny of one might signally differ from those of another. And, after all, in the case of ancestor worship, it is the worship that receives the main emphasis. It is rather the relation that the sons sustain to the father than that which the father sustains to the sons. In many respects it is a most pathetic religion, because all the devotion is let down into the unanswering dark. It is a river that flows steadily onward to its ocean, but it does not bear back upon its bosom from the ocean either a message of affection, or a freight of blessing. Out of the void hearts of such gods little could men expect to hear a command, little need they fear the enunciation of an authority or a judgment.

But the Hebrews had strong affinities both for Polytheism and for Ancestor worship, traces of which appear now and again above the surface. The names of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, that patriarchal trinity standing majestically at the portals of the nation's history, own a sacredness next only to the name of Jehovah himself. And anyone who should attempt to account for their idea of heredity without due deference to their remarkable regard for ancestry would miss a most important stepping-stone toward his conclusions. One may truthfully claim that had it not been for this strong element of reverence for the fathers, this relic, it may be, of a prehistoric Ancestor worship, the doctrine of heredity could

never have become the instrument for the powerful shaping of Israel. And further; had not Ancestor worship in other nations remained a submerged religion, unsubjected to the control of a deity arising superior to it, the idea of heredity would easily have grown to occupy an important position in other civilizations as well as among the Hebrews; which is to say again that it was Monotheism that made a second commandment understandable.

The decalogue opens with Henotheism; there is a recognition of other gods, but Jehovah is to be Israel's God. However, this much having been duly conceded, the concession seems to be forgotten. Henotheism was in those exclusive days practically as effective as Monotheism; in fact the former was potentially the latter. It is the next to the last epoch in the evolution from the religion of the innumerable to the religion of the One. If we conceive of religious history as a passing upward from Polytheism to Kathenotheism, to Henotheism, to Monotheism—it is a certainty that heredity could not be a vigorous idea in the first stage nor the second; but that in the third and the last it might be so. Now, Henotheism, for its efficacy, depends upon certain conditions. Its professors must be an independent people living in their own country; for the god of this faith belongs to the particular geographical limits as much as to the particular people. Its constituents must be an undivided nation. When the god of Henotheism becomes the god of another unassimilated nation, the first step has been taken toward Monotheism. If the nation is divided or subjected, there is again either a step toward a Monotheistic faith, or else a robbery of religion, a defeat of the god by stronger gods. We remember that the experiences of Israel, first in suffering division, and again in being subjected and carried away captive, seriously modified her idea of heredity. And this fact is largely due to the more important fact, that her conception of deity was radically disturbed, and ultimately also radically altered. It must therefore be apparent that the religious thoughts of the various

peoples of antiquity were the controlling agents that brought to light, or shadowed or obliterated the idea of heredity as a spiritual power. This is true with reference to the differing conceptions of deity; let us now examine into the influences of the beliefs concerning a future life.

There are at least four distinct views that the ancients entertained of the future. The first is what we shall call the Post-mortual, of which the Egyptians are the most notable exponents. According to this faith, the soul at death passes on into another world, for which the present is the necessary preparation. A great part of Egypt's religion consisted in learning magical formulas which the soul would need to know in its journeys in the realm beyond death. There was, to be sure, an ethical value of high order in connection with a faith which, like this, looked forward to a divine judgment at which the individual would be obliged to say with truth: "I have not stolen; I have not injured the gods; I have not blasphemed," and the like. And it were futile to deny that persons struggling valiantly on toward the dread scales of such a judgment would bequeath to their progeny a morality that otherwise might have been an entailment of depravity. Still, it is evident that this transmission, so unconsciously given, had its source in motives that were inherently selfish. This selfishness, that might otherwise have utterly depraved the whole doctrine, was somewhat redeemed by the belief that after the successful judgment the soul would have the mission of ministering to the ancestors that had preceded it in the judgment. Thus, again we see the appearance of that determined disposition to look backward, a trait that was the very nature of almost every ancient faith. There was, of course, in this backward glance the implication of a forward glance as well; for "to care for the dead is the first duty of the living, and a man must marry in order to have offspring who will pay him the necessary attention after his death." The selfishness of such a system was not calculated to provide for it a long survival.

The strong other-world consciousness and faith of Christianity in the middle ages and since were not a healthy indication. However much one may regret the shadows that hover over the tomb, it is the bulwark of a growing religion that humanity is willing to let the Hand of Light push away the shadows in due season, whilst this frail hand of flesh is toiling to shape this world for the generations that are to be, and in the character that now is, molding these generations for the world that is growing gradually away from its chaos.

The second view is the gloomy doctrine of transmigration. In its main character, as well as in its tendencies, this view is essentially post-mortal. It too has an under-world; but in this case it is located in the visible bodies of beasts, and not in mystery. One cannot in this latter case, any more than in the former, deny a certain ethical value to it. It is a more desperate notion than the purely post-mortal. Its grosser materialism makes it the more dreadful. Yet it wrought by the feeling of horror two advantages, at least; it caused the individual soul to do whatever it deemed necessary to escape the passage into beast-life after human life was done. It also encouraged a consideration and mercy for the animal world. But as in the case of the former view, so also in this, the main vitality is derived from selfishness. This selfishness, too, is somewhat redeemed by the thought of mercy for the lower animals. But this is only an indirect consequence. The idea of altruism has here no room to be born, much less any room to grow.

The third view we shall term the Fragmentary Temporal. We have an apt illustration of it in the New Year's Festival of Babylon, when it was believed that the god Merodach entered the fate-chamber under the mountain of the rising sun and there determined the fates for the ensuing year and wrote them on the fate-tablets which he bore with him. Here he prescribed the woes and sorrows, the joys, the successes, the mistakes and failures, life and death of all his people. In addition to these tablets of fate the gods had other tablets

recording sins. One prayer has this petition: "May the tablets of his sin be thrown into the water." Fatalism, in short, quite defines what we mean by the Fragmentary Temporal. In fatalism there is, indeed, a thought of the future, but it is at once treacherous and fixed. Treacherous, because it may change its aspects in a moment's time, without warning, at the caprice of some god, in spite of what the subject soul may do or not do. Fixed, because when the fate is once written or declared, it is bound to come to pass. Only in the extremest cases could valor or virtue, intention, or the accomplishment of a great feat, in the least wise modify its sovereign sway. This conception of the future can lay no claim to any ethical power whatever. It cannot even indirectly influence for good. For, if the individual is not in any control whatever over his own character or fortunes, how could he come even to dream of the power to control the condition of his children? If the god himself each year must determine afresh what his subjects are to be, how should one of these subjects arise to the sublimity whence his eyes could sweep out beyond the horizon of one year and many years, to determine the destinies of multitudes not yet included in the little imaginations of his calculating god? This conception is a monstrosity, the thought-form of a hideous idol-face not yet impressed upon patient stone or iron. It stands like a black phantom over the very gods themselves, and treads the tender hearts of men like grapes in the wine-press, into the passionless dust of the grave.

Two remarks need to be made concerning these three views of the future. The first is that they are not mutually exclusive; one religion may entertain the three together. It is, perhaps, not possible to find a nation that held to any one of the three to the exclusion of all the rest. The second remark is that the three alike are decidedly individualistic. They have to do with the solitary heart. There is hardly a trace of a social consciousness. About the only thing that men hold

in common, according to these views, is each his own share in a common doom or destiny.

If now, we turn to consider the fourth and final view of the future we shall easily see a difference that amounts to a great superiority over the rest. Let us call it the Extended Temporal view. It has no philosophy of the under-world. So far as it is concerned, Sheol is a blank, a poetic word for saying nothing. As the shores of the ancient sea trackless and mysterious, marked the end of the world beyond which only the pinioned bird dared point the prow, so the grave was the actual end of life beyond which even the dreams of the doughty refused to explore. This view had no respect for fate; it owned a masterful affection for providence. It forgot the individual in its big concern for the social. Selfhood was wonderfully redeemed by its care for others. It was the very heart-text of the gospel of altruism. "If a man die shall he live again?" Ah, but a man shall not die. The form of the father falls, but lo! in his place stands a son! The children are the reappearance of their parents, the new manifestations of an old identity. For Israel there was no future under the sod, behind the solemn walls of rock-tombs. Her future was above, on the fair harvest-fields, reaping the golden grain, drinking the fresh waters from flowing fountains, walking up the hills to the glad temple-praise, reaching out hands filled with blessings to all the peoples of the earth. And what a future to live for! It might be worth while for one to order his days so that he would merit the continuation of them in shadow-lands beyond the sunken eyes and pulseless heart. But it was the very sublimity of ethics to order aright the present life in order that the unborn might rejoice hereafter in the sun-lit world which the fathers were so loathe to leave behind them.

And what was the secret that wrought this remarkable discrepancy between Israel's idea and that of her contemporaries? It must have been the exalted form of her religion. There is the root of the whole matter. Out of whatsoever darkness,

palpable darkness though it was, that she brought her religious conceptions—they, and they alone, under the hand of Jehovah, marked the beginning of her excellence. However crude her rites; her very faith however poor in its demands and its bestowments; her character, though flecked with every blot of ancient immorality, it stands as the colossal miracle of all history that one people should attain to such a magnificent pre-eminence over all the others. It was the purpose and the work of a far-seeing Providence.

This superiority came from her vigorous conception of God as a moral governor, and from her conviction that his ultimate demand is righteousness. Other peoples knew what virtue was; patriotism, courage, even religiosity were by no means strangers to them; but these existed in their estimation, as their own rewards. But here comes Israel with a new thought—moral integrity. It is a new thing among the theologies of men. It is the gospel of the broken heart. Their God laughed at the vanities of heathendom; they only knew how rightly to approach him. They came with swords and battle-cries; they came with the trophies of victory, with the first-fruits and burnt sacrifices of beasts and incense; they came with gorgeous tabernacles and temples, with harp and psalm; they came, quite aware that all these things were the mere outward semblance of inward realities, or else they were nothing at all; they came with that simple, pathetic but beautiful gift, casting it down with an anguish and a joy—a heart that knew itself broken by the penetrating gaze of a righteous God. And they knew they were not despised. Nor were they destitute. For as they advanced day by day toward the inevitable night, they bore a promise in the bosom; their faithfulness, which is to say, their righteousness, should bloom anew and bear its fruit far forth in the generations that had not yet awoke. And these days looking back to theirs; and these eyes of ours from the pinnacle of the centuries peering back to the morning are witnesses that God is true, and that the fathers were not deceived.

VIII.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

"BABEL UND BIBEL."

"Babel und Bibel" is the subject of a series of now famous lectures delivered by Friederich Delitzsch in the Academy of Music of Berlin. The lecturer is the son of the late Franz Delitzsch, the Old Testament scholar, and professor of Assyriology in the University of Berlin. Under the brief and popular title the relation between the results of Babylonian excavations and the contents of the Bible is discussed. The audience, assembled January 13, 1902, was composed of members of the German Oriental Society, among whom is His Majesty the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Germany, who was, also, present. The lecturer, the audience and the subject combined in making the occasion memorable. Yet no one dreamt how great a wood this little fire would kindle.

The somewhat liberal views as to the influence of Babylonia on the religious concepts of the Israelites aroused comment and unfavorable criticism in the audience. The Emperor was so favorably impressed, or perhaps so unfavorably, that he invited Dr. Delitzsch to repeat his lecture in the Royal Palace, in the presence of the Empress, the court, and invited guests. The invitation was accepted and the lecture repeated on February 1, 1902. It was then published in the form of an innocent booklet and, with the notice it had already received in the daily and religious periodicals, it circulated rapidly over Europe and soon reached the United States. The result was a flood of newspaper articles, pamphlets, and books, which now constitute the literature of the "Babel und Bibel" controversy. In the replies we find views favorable and unfavorable to those presented in the lecture. Every

school of theological thought is represented from the conservatives to the radicals. Both conservatives, from whom we should expect it, and liberals, from whom we should not expect it, oppose the conclusions in the lecture.

In the meantime Dr. Delitzsch had left Berlin to superintend the excavations in Babylon. After an absence of seventeen weeks he returned to be greeted by piles of literature in answer to his first lecture. Thereupon he prepared a second lecture and delivered it, January 12, 1903, again in the presence of the Emperor and the Empress and a distinguished suite. In less than a month 30,000 copies of this lecture were sold. Some of the answers have reached the ninth edition. Instead of pouring oil on the troubled waters, the lecturer maintained his former positions by more copious illustrations, made more advanced statements, and provoked more serious opposition. Rumors circulated that he not only attacked the authority of the Old Testament, but questioned the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith. By reason of his membership in the Oriental Society, his attendance on the lectures, and his position as *summus episcopus* of the Prussian Church, the Emperor was constrained to address a letter on this subject to the first Vice-President of the Oriental Society, Admiral Hollman. The letter was written, not only with the views of Dr. Delitzsch as expressed in the lectures in mind, but with the views of the lecturer, expressed in private conversation, that he did not share the faith of the Church in the Godhead of Christ and that among other grounds the study of the Old Testament had dispelled the belief, before him. On this account the Emperor felt it his duty to make a public declaration of his views on the points involved.

The letter states that Dr. Delitzsch "upset many a cherished conception" with which the people "link ideas that are sacred and dear to them." He adds significantly, "that is an achievement which only a mighty genius should venture to attempt, but for which the mere study of assyriology is not enough to qualify anyone." He, also, warns scholars against

a hasty presentation of the results of scholarship before an unprepared people. "As a theologian by profession, he can state, in the form of theological treatises, theses, hypotheses, and theories, as well as convictions, what it would not be proper to advance in a popular lecture or book." Referring to his own views of revelation the Emperor distinguishes between a general and continuous revelation on the one hand, and a specific and purely religious revelation culminating in the Messiah on the other. "With regard to the first kind of revelation, I have to say there is to my mind not the slightest doubt that God constantly and continually reveals himself in the human race. * * * He follows with fatherly love and interest the development of the human race; in order to lead it and to advance it further, he 'reveals' himself now in this, now in that, great sage, whether it be priest or king, whether it be among heathens, Jews, or Christians. Hammurabi was one of these, and so were Moses, Abraham, Homer, Charlemagne, Luther, Shakespeare, Goethe, Kant, the Emperor William the Great. * * * God has certainly 'revealed' himself to divers persons in divers ways corresponding to the position of a nation and the standard of civilization it has attained, and he still does so in our day."

"The second kind of revelation, the more strictly religious, is that which leads up to the appearance of our Lord. From Abraham onward, it is introduced slowly, but with prescient vision, infinite wisdom, and infinite knowledge, or else mankind would have been lost." Then he traces the special revelation in Abraham, Moses, and their successors. By God's direct intervention the oppressed Israelites emerge once more from Egypt and settle in Palestine. "And so the process continues through the centuries until the Messiah foretold and announced by prophets and psalmists, at last appears. This was the greatest revelation of God in the world. For he appeared in the Son himself; Christ is God; God in human form."

He, also, defines his conception of the O. T. as the word of

God. "For us Evangelicals, in particular, the word has through Luther become our all, and as a good theologian Delitzsch ought not to forget that our great Luther has taught us to sing and to believe "the word they must allow to stand." Yet he is willing to admit "that the O. T. contains a number of passages which are of the nature of purely human history and are not 'God's revealed word.' * * * For example, the act of the giving of the Law on Mt. Sinai can only symbolically be regarded as inspired by God, inasmuch as Moses was obliged to resort to the revival of laws which perhaps had long been known (possibly they originated in the Codex of Hammurabi) in order to draw and bind together the structure of his people. * * * The historian may be able * * * to establish at this point a connection with the laws of Hammurabi, the friend of Abraham, and the link would perhaps be logically correct; but this would never invalidate the fact that God prompted Moses and to this extent revealed himself to the people of Israel."

This imperial utterance is positive and progressive. It became the object of comment second in interest only to the lectures themselves. The Emperor grants German scholars absolute freedom of research, but guards them against drawing false conclusions from their data and an imprudent publication of their views to the detriment of the faith of the common man. On the question of inspiration he differs from the old orthodox view. He does not identify the O. T. and the word of God, but finds God's word in the O. T. He renounces the dictation theory and believes that the biblical writers used documents and traditions, which came from various sources, and with the aid of God's spirit prepared them for the sacred narrative.

The story of the controversy would not be complete without a reference to Professor Harnack's letter on the Emperor's letter. In his inimitable manner he praises and censures his colleague Delitzsch and agrees with and differs from His Majesty the Emperor. He welcomes the fact that the former

"has inculcated upon extensive circles a more correct view of the O. T." But in the next breath he asks, has he indeed done this? Among other things he says in reply, "to my mind he has not done enough to keep his hearers and readers from forming an erroneous impression." He implies also, that the effect of the lectures has been to cause the people to disparage the O. T. "Again, because up to the present moment a superhuman idea of the O. T. has prevailed, it follows according to a well-known psychological law that now the pendulum of appreciation swings to the opposite extreme. And in truth in the very lanes and alleys one may overhear the statement that from the O. T. there 'is now nothing to be got.'" In this very happy manner he finds a legitimate place for the Emperor's letter.

The latter he praises for the "absolute freedom" which he accords to German scholars. The Emperor "further recognizes that theology cannot shirk these questions, but that they must be threshed out most thoroughly with courage and freedom. He hands them over to theological science." He emphasizes with approval the last sentence of the imperial letter, which reads as follows: "Religion has never been a product of science, but an outpouring of the heart and being of man, caused by his intercourse with God."

Professor Harnack, however, differs from the Emperor's theory of a double revelation and the formula he used in regard to the divinity of Christ. In regard to revelation he says: "There cannot consequently be two revelations—religion, moral force and knowledge being most closely interwoven—but only one, the bearers of which were and are in truth wholly different from each other in character, vocation and mission." On the deity of Christ he says: "The Christian community is bound to repudiate every appreciation of Christ *which effaces the difference between him and the other teachers.* * * * But whether for all that the cast-iron formula 'Godhead of Christ' is correct may, nay must, be questioned. He himself did not use it, but chose other desig-

nations; and whether any one of his disciples ever uttered it is, to put it moderately, very doubtful. But even the ancient Church did not speak without qualification of the Godhead of Christ, but always of his divinity and humanity. Thus, even in the sense of the old dogma, 'God-manhood' is the only correct formula. * * * The Pauline saying, 'God was in Christ,' seems to be the last word which we can venture to utter here, after having slowly and painfully freed ourselves from the delusion of ancient philosophers, that we can fathom the mysteries of God and nature, humanity and history."

After having gone somewhat afield in giving an account of the external history of the controversy, let us add that a third and last lecture was promised and, if we err not, has since been delivered. Of the third lecture Dr. Delitzsch said in advance: "It will show that it lies much closer to my heart to maintain and to build than to overthrow and make away with pillars that have grown tottering." If it has been delivered we have not seen it in print nor have we heard of its impression. The question that we are now interested in is, what were some of the objectionable theories or statements in the first two lectures?

After showing how the inscriptions taken from Babylonian mounds corroborate many biblical statements, lend color to prophecy and give meaning to hitherto obscure passages and allusions, he proceeds to show how there prevailed a widespread Babylonian civilization and culture as early as 2250 B. C., the days of Hammurabi. Babylon was a political and religious center from which came civil codes and religious ideals. The most notable code is that of Hammurabi, lately discovered and published. "Trade and commerce, cattle-breeding and agriculture, were at their prime, and the sciences, *e. g.*, geometry, mathematics, and, above all, astronomy, had reached a degree of development which again and again moves even the astronomers of to-day to admiration and astonishment. Not Paris, at the outside Rome, can compete with Babylon in respect of the influence which it exercised upon

the world throughout two thousand years." This influence was not confined to the Tigris and Euphrates region, but covered the then civilized world. From the El-Amarna tablets, discovered in Egypt in 1887, he shows that there was extensive correspondence between the kings of Egypt, Babylonia and Palestine in the Babylonian writing and language. The latter language was used in official intercourse between the Euphrates and the Nile, which proves the dominant influence of Babylonian culture and literature "from 2200 to beyond 1400 B. C."

With this background and environment he continues to show how the twelve tribes of Israel, when they invaded Canaan, came under the influence of Babylonian culture. This would become a molding factor in the history of the young nation, which would manifest itself in the religious, social, and intellectual life. Space will not allow us to state extensively the traces of Babylonia in the O. T. and we shall therefore summarize them as follows: 1, The stories of Genesis concerning creation, fall, flood, etc., existed in an earlier form among the Babylonians; 2, monotheism was known in the days of Hammurabi, before Abram came; 3, the name Yahwê was used on Babylonian tablets before it was known among the Hebrews. These are some of the central ideas from Babylonia, while various other rites, ceremonies and practices of Israel are referred to the same source. For instance, "the coinage, the system of weights and measures, the outward forms of the law—'if a man does so and so, he shall so and so'—are precisely Babylonian." The Sabbath, also, finds its origin beyond Israel. Says Delitzsch: "It is scarcely possible for us to doubt that we owe the blessings decreed in the Sabbath or Sunday day of rest in the last resort to that ancient and civilized race on the Tigris and Euphrates." It has been generally known that there is a Babylonian flood story, a creation-epic, and a representation of the temptation and fall of man. He finds a high order of ethical life in that period. The substance of the biblical commandments is found in Baby-

lonian precepts. The people felt themselves to be entirely dependent on the gods. "It is even more noteworthy that they, too, regarded all human suffering, illness in particular, and finally death, as a punishment for sins. In Babel, as in the Bible, the sense of sin is the dominating force everywhere." In the second lecture, after he has drawn a number of new parallels between Babel and the Bible he exclaims: "How utterly alike everything is in Babylon and Bible! Here as there we are struck by the fondness shown for illustrating speech and thought by symbolic action (I call to mind the scapegoat which was driven into the wilderness): here as there we meet with the same world of perpetual wonders and signs; of continuous revelation, principally in dreams; the same naive representations of the godhead;—just as in Babylon the gods eat and drink, and even betake themselves to rest, so Yahwè goes forth in the cool of the evening to walk in Paradise, and takes pleasure in the sweet scent of Noah's sacrifice; and just as in the O. T. Yahwè speaks to Moses and Aaron, and to all the prophets, so the gods in Babylon spoke to men, either directly or through the mouth of their priests and inspired prophets and prophetesses."

We naturally ask, what is wrong with these assertions? Why do they arouse such intense opposition? Both the Christian conscience and the conclusions of Semitic scholarship seem to have been violated. There is reason for this agitation, although that it should have broken out now is strange. The views of Dr. Delitzsch are by no means new. Professor Haupt points out the fact that "twenty years ago Delitzsch delivered a lecture on the location of Paradise, which contained just as much that was new and revolutionary from the traditional point of view as his recent lecture on Babel and Bible, but—the German Emperor was not present and did not command a repetition of the lecture at the Imperial Palace; nor did he deem it necessary to define his faith in an open letter." Even the general reader is aware of the fact that ever since the Babylonian tablets have been deciphered, men

have written books, articles, and lectures to show how many elements of the O. T. agreed with Babylonian conceptions and were probably taken from that source. The occasion for the opposition at present was the popular style in which the great assyriologist of Berlin presented his conclusions. Authority, simplicity, brevity, and the Emperor served to arouse attention, call forth comparisons, and to cause men to feel a conflict between their religious traditions and the general standpoint of the lecturer. The cause, however, for criticism is more important than the occasion. It is twofold; first, the prevalent conception of an original revelation in Israel is shattered if Delitzsch is right, and, second, certain conclusions of modern Semitic scholars are wrong in the light of the lecture. Hence the opposition from the preacher and people who cling to their traditions and from the scholars who love their hypotheses.

The traditional theory of inspiration is at stake and with it one view of the Scriptures and the Word of God. The conception of original revelation is that every part of the Bible, chapter, word and letter, was communicated directly by God's spirit to the sacred writer. If, indeed, the Spirit did not dictate words to the inspired penman, He, at least, brought the whole content of the Bible to its authors. In Israel alone do we have a pure and true revelation. Elsewhere we have only a corrupt and degenerate religion, without truth or virtue. The former is of God, the latter of fallen man and the devil. Those holding this theory, either in its literal sense or in a modified form, cannot admit that the writers of the Bible received part or all of their material from sources beyond Israel. To yield such a point would be for them to give up their Bible and their faith. Therefore, the violent outcry against Delitzsch.

The scholarly opponents of the lectures occupy a different ground. They are not primarily concerned with a theory of inspiration, but with their hypotheses. For example, scholars have said that the religion of the O. T. was largely influ-

enced by Egyptian traditions, others have traced it to Arabia. These men agree that the environment and tradition were aids to the authors in the production of Biblical books, or that Israel received many social, religious, and historic elements from abroad. From what sources they came can only be determined by scientific investigations. Many of the assumptions of higher critics have been rudely shaken. The theory that the religious ideas evolved in an orderly sequence in Israel, an assumption by which even the documents have been dated, is called into question by a statement that many of these ideas may have come from Babylon. "Much that was regarded as Persian in origin may turn out older than Abraham." With the monotheistic idea among Semites before Abraham, the popular conception that the Yahwè religion evolved out of fetichism is no longer tenable. Therefore many critics, supposedly with sympathy for Delitzsch's positions, have opposed him. Special opposition was aroused by the statement that the name Yahwè is found on three Babylonian clay tablets in the British Museum. From this fact he concludes that "Yahwè was the spiritual possession of those same nomad tribes out of which after a thousand years the children of Israel were to emerge." He is refuted here on philological grounds. Scholars of authority claim that the translation is very uncertain and that Delitzsch has erred. This, too, is not a matter of religious conviction but of philological science.

Whether Delitzsch is right or wrong in his positions cannot be decided by an appeal to church dogma or tradition. The fact that his conclusions jar with tradition does not permit us to condemn him or rule him out of court, but it does compel us to investigate, compare, and refute Delitzsch, if he is wrong, with the scholarly methods of Delitzsch. New facts and data may compel the church to reconstruct many of its theories. But if Christian theologians will attempt to shut the mouth of scientific scholarship they become more of enemies than of friends to the Christ, who said: "Ye shall know

the truth and the truth will make you free." It is our duty, who are not Assyriologists and Semitic specialists, to let these men fight out their battles and to accept undoubted conclusions, whether they agree with our theories or not. For we may know that our theory is wrong, if it does not account for the extant facts.

So far as original revelation is concerned, with its allied doctrines, we may say with Professor Oettli, whose answer to Delitzsch has gone through a second edition: "According to the almost universally prevailing conviction, the existing state of the text compels us to abandon the overstrained dogma of inspiration, which sees in Holy Writ the unerring word of God, inspired even down to its very wording." The idea that the authority of the O. T. is invalidated by the use of traditions and previously existing documents is based on narrow and untenable premises. It limits the sphere of God's activity, flies in the face of plain facts, and suppresses the free activity of the writer. Grant that the creation, fall and flood stories, which existed in a cruder form in Babylon, were used as material out of which the narrative in Genesis was constructed. What would be the result? We should then compare the Babylonian version with the Biblical and find what scholars have universally found. Professor Stade, of Giessen, who is by no means "conservative," asserts that the mythological ideas of the Babylonians have undergone complete regeneration under the spirit of the religion of Jehovah. He says: "The relation between the Biblical story of the fall of man in Paradise and the corresponding section of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic is about the same as the difference between a pure mountain spring and the filthy water of a village puddle." These ancient myths have been chastened, reconstructed, and improved by one who was filled with a purer spirit, even the spirit of the Holy and Righteous God, than the original myths themselves. The process through which traditions passed may be compared to the composition of Faust. The Faust legend comes from the middle ages. It

floated down the centuries and was often repeated as an interesting story. But it became the framework of the greatest German classic and one of the greatest literary productions of mankind, only when the spirit of Goethe laid hold of it and transformed it into his own image. In the same way the great religious geniuses of the Hebrew race, walking with God and filled with His Spirit, appropriated the myths and legends of the past and transformed them into vessels for the revelation of God in His relation to man and the world. On that account the Bible is primarily the book of God, the great exponent of religion, and the revelation of eternal life. But we should always remember that we have this treasure in earthen vessels. The form may partake of human imperfections, but the contents remains eternal truth. Dr. Paul Haupt, of Johns Hopkins University, says: "The saving truths declared in the sacred Scriptures cannot be affected by any legitimate research, and no Christian investigator need be afraid of the consequences of his researches, provided that he can say of himself, I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

G. W. R.

NOTE 1. The two lectures on Babel and Bible have been translated and edited, with an introduction, by C. H. W. Johns, M.A. They are published in this form by Putnam's Sons. This edition contains references to, and abstracts from, the leading replies, which enable the reader to follow the arguments pro and con intelligently.

NOTE 2. A scholarly refutation of Delitzsch's views has been published in the *Princeton Theological Review*, April, 1903, by Professor Robt. Dick Wilson, entitled "Babylon and Israel: A Comparison of their Leading Ideas Based Upon their Vocabularies."

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

[Any books noticed in this REVIEW can be obtained, at the lowest prices, of the *Reformed Church Publication Board*, 1306 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.]

ESSAYS, VERSES, AND TRANSLATIONS BY THOMAS CONRAD PORTER, D.D., LL.D., WITH BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH. By Rev. Samuel A. Martin, Editor. Pages 123. Chambersburg. 1903.

The old students and friend of Dr. Porter, of whom the present writer counts himself one, will cordially thank the editor for this memorial volume. It is a pleasure to us at least to have this opportunity afforded us of renewing our acquaintance with one of the earliest of our college teachers. Many of the essays and poems of this little volume recall old memories of the days of long ago, when we heard their author recite them in the class room. These publications are evidences of Dr. Porter's literary ability, and of his geniality as a man and author. The translation of the *Dies Ira*, which was published a few years ago in THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, will be acknowledged as a production of much merit by all who are competent to form a judgment in such a case.

The *Biographical Sketch* will be much appreciated by the older readers of this REVIEW, who knew Dr. Porter so well in the early part of his life. It is an excellent specimen of this kind of composition, and will cause the reader to wish that there were more of it. However, what there is, is sufficient to give us a fair degree of knowledge of the life and character of its subject. Dr. Porter was born at Alexandria, Pennsylvania, in 1822, of Swiss and Scotch-Irish ancestry. He was originally of the Presbyterian faith, and studied at Lafayette College and Princeton Theological Seminary. A few years after his ordination he became a member of the Reformed Church, of which he continued to hold membership to the time of his death, and to whose institutions at Lancaster he bequeathed a sum of ten thousand dollars, though in consequence of legal obstacles they failed to receive it. Dr. Porter was for many years professor of natural history in Marshall College at Mercersburg, and later in Franklin and Marshall at Lancaster, Pa. He was one of the foremost botanists of the State, and was generally well up to date in other branches of natural science. He was, however, while progressive, also cautious and careful. For example, we remember hearing him say once, some

three or four years after the *Origin of Species* was published, that there was no doubt *species* were directly created, while *varieties* were the products of development. We have reason to believe that on this subject he afterwards changed his mind, but certainly not until after full and complete study.

In regard to Dr. Porter's theological position we take the liberty of quoting a few paragraphs from the volume before us.

"As a theologian he was conservative without being narrow. The traditions of his family, the teaching of his early life, and his college and seminary training were all in the lines of the most scholarly orthodoxy of the time. These gave him a foundation for theological scholarship that was broad and accurate, and enabled him to appreciate the truth revealed in nature without any of that nervous apprehension which so often distresses the small theologian in the presence of modern scientific teaching.

"His thorough familiarity with both realms made his judgment in all cases of supposed conflict between science and the Bible very valuable. The petty disputes over the clash of scientific discoveries and some traditional interpretations of a passage of scripture rarely interested him. He never allowed himself to be drawn into a controversy on such subjects. For more than twenty-five years he lectured to his students on science and religion, and in these lectures he discussed with the utmost freedom every question of the day pertaining to this field, and uttered his convictions with perfect frankness. His views were often very far in advance of those generally accepted by his church at the time. Yet such was their confidence in his scholarship and good judgment that his orthodoxy was never called in question by his brethren."

We extend our cordial thanks to the editor of this volume, the Rev. Mr. Martin, for this copy of the same, and we heartily join with him in revering the memory of Dr. Porter.

W. RUPP, D.D.

TWIN DEMONS, or the Four Headed Dragons and How to Slay Them. The Practical Psychology of Fear and Worry. By Stanley Lefevre Krebs, A.M. Pages 128. James H. Shaw, Publisher, Bloomington, Ill. 1903.

The author of this little book is well known to the readers of this REVIEW, as an able preacher, a public lecturer, and a writer on various practical and psychological subjects. The theme of this volume is *fear and worry*. These twin enemies of humanity, the author says, kill more men and women than perish in battle. The causes are four, namely, physical, intellectual, and spiritual. Mr. Krebs is a student of psychology, and has a work in preparation on that subject now, which the public will be glad to welcome. The volume before us is intended to be practical and helpful. The style is strong and racy. The book is easy to read. When

once commenced, no one will willingly lay it down, until he has read it through. A few specimens of style and manner of reasoning may here be given. The author is writing of the curse of fear upon morals, and this is what he says on a familiar subject: "The dipsomaniac fears he can not keep away from the saloon; his friends give him the 'suggestion' direct or indirect (that is he overhears them say) that his will is weak, which idea still further weakens him; he tacitly and often openly admits the power of drink over him, which admission still further strengthens his fear, and so when the long arm of the saloon-smell reaches him across the street, it seizes, drags him up to the bar, and there crushes him like a slave." The special advocates of temperance have no doubt often done much harm to this cause, by dwelling on the weakness of the will to resist the temptation of young men to indulge in intoxicating drinks. If young men were told plainly that of course they can resist, and that they deserve no sympathy for yielding to temptation there would be far less intemperance than we witness now. If Mr. Krebs could bring about a change of sentiment on this point, his book would not have been written in vain. Here is another specimen of the author's writing: "Fear with its diabolical brood of misgivings, apprehensions, suspicions, jealousies, pessimisms, despairs, insanities, is the modern realization of the mythical harpies, anthropophagies, succubæ, ghouls, vampires, gargoyles, Zohaks, dahaks, grendels, pythons, and the whole host of demons which people humanity's self-formed hell." The following is the advice which Mr. Krebs gives to all weak and fearful souls: "Don't worry—but work. Don't fear—but follow. Don't pine—but pray. Don't trouble—but trust." *Trust in God* is the one remedy that is able to make men strong, healthy and happy. We commend this little book to our readers.

W. RUPP, D.D.

THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY IN THE EARLY CENTURIES. By Thomas M. Lindsay, D.D., Principal of the Glasgow College of the United Free Church of Scotland. The Eighteenth Series of the Cunningham Lectures. Pages 398. A. C. Armstrong and Son, 3 and 5 W. Eighteenth Street, N. Y.

The reader of this volume will be aided in understanding the significance of the positions taken by the author on the organization of the early Church by first reading the Appendix, entitled, "Sketch of the History of Modern Controversy about the Office-bearers in the Primitive Christian Churches." This contains a valuable summary of the theories held by Lightfoot, Hatch and Harnack, and Seyerlen, Loening, Loofs and Schmiedel. Lightfoot began the modern discussions on the Christian ministry in his Essay published in 1868. His theory of the identity of

bishop and presbyter in the apostolic church and therefore of a two-fold ministry in the first century, was generally accepted. Scholars, also, with the exception of some high churchmen, who would rather sacrifice facts of history than give up their pet theories, agreed with Lightfoot's explanation of the origin of the three-fold ministry in the second and third centuries.

A new theory of the original relation of bishop and presbyter, and of the development of church polity in the post-apostolic age was advanced by Dr. Hatch in his article in the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, and in a book on the Organization of the Early Christian Churches, published in 1881. Professor Harnack, of Berlin, translated this volume into German, added notes and original researches, and thus the Hatch-Harnack theory was evolved. This theory was followed by Weizsäcker, Sohm and others. But there arose a third school, who opposed it, which was led by Loening, Seyerlen, Loofs, and finally by Schmiedel.

In his treatment of the subject Dr. Lindsay shows himself thoroughly acquainted with the authorities on the continent as well as with the sources in the early church. He alludes to the points on which he differs from modern scholars, but agrees in the main in accepting their method of research. He disclaims agreement, however, with the critical methods and results of Schmiedel in his article, "Ministry," in *Encyclopedia Biblica*.

In the preface he admits three assumptions which guide him in the discussion. First, "there is a visible Catholic Church of Christ, consisting of all those who visibly worship the same God and Father, profess their faith in the same Saviour, and are taught by the same Holy Spirit; but I do not see any Scriptural or even primitive warrant for insisting that Catholicity *must* find visible expression in a uniformity of organization, of ritual, of worship, or even of formulated Creed"; second, "There is and must be a valid ministry of some sort in the churches which are branches of this one Visible Catholic Church of Christ; but I do not think that the fact that the church possesses an authority which is a direct gift from God necessarily means that the authority must exist in a class or caste of superior office-bearers endowed with a grace and therefore with a power 'specific, exclusive and efficient,' and that it *cannot* be delegated to the ministry by the Christian people"; third, analogies in organization illustrative of the life of the primitive Christian communities can be more easily found on the modern mission fields than among the organized churches of Christian Europe. These postulates at once reveal the standpoint from which the author studies his subject and are in a measure the conclusions he has reached.

In a very lucid way he treats of the New Testament conception of the Church, defining it both by means of tracing the origin

and use of the term "ecclesia" among Hebrews and Greeks, and by determining its meaning in New Testament and Patristic usage. Five marks or notes are said to characterize the conception of the early Church. They are: *Fellowship, Unity, Visibility, Authority*, and the *Sacerdotal Idea*. The sections, in which he expounds these characteristics, are especially valuable. They are based on a careful exegesis and are pervaded by the spirit of true protestantism. The keynote of his idea of the Church and of her development is that "the Christian Democracy is, also, a Theocracy." "The authority which the Church possesses is altogether different from what a voluntary association of men may exercise upon its members, and of another kind from what is possessed by lawful civil government. The authority comes from Christ Himself." But he is very careful to show that it comes from Christ, not through a divinely ordained Order, but through the membership or the body of the Church, of which Christ is the head. It comes *from above*, no less than if mediated through a priesthood, when it is vested in the Christian community. In this view he differs from the Romanists, who claim Christ vested authority in Peter, and from the Anglicans, who make a similar claim for the eleven, and from the old protestant school, which held that Christ gave authority directly to the ministry, though the ministry is only one, and not three, orders. The new theory is that government, worship, teaching, administration are fruits of the Spirit, charisms. They are functions of the whole church, but those, who were charismatically endowed, were permitted to exercise their gifts for the welfare of the whole community. The school of Hatch and Harnack, as well as their opponents, agree in regarding authority to have come from Christ but to have belonged to the body of Christians, instead of an order. In this respect Dr. Lindsay is in harmony with the latest critical and protestant scholarship.

Space will allow us simply to outline the manner of treatment by enumerating the well-chosen titles for the eight lectures. In the second lecture a picture is presented of the Church in apostolic times. The many debatable points, such as the house churches, the kinds of meetings, the eucharistia, are carefully discussed and the conclusions impress one as sound and satisfactory. The third lecture treats of the Prophetic Ministry of the Primitive Church, which he describes as three-fold, viz., apostles, prophets and teachers. Besides the prophetic, he finds, also, a local ministry which was limited to the congregation and was concerned largely with administration. In the following five lectures he traces the development, from the rather indefinite apostolic forms, of the college of presbyter-bishops, assisted by a body of deacons; in the second and third centuries the office of bishop became distinct

from that of presbyter, and the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter, and deacon is evolved. The early prophetic ministry passes away and its functions are assumed by the bishop and the presbyter. This change did not come about without protest and reaction. Montanism was an erratic effort to preserve the primitive organization and save the Church from an aristocracy of bishops. The transition was completed when the ministry was made a mediating priesthood and we get the Church ideas of Cyprian. He made "the bishop a unique priest and eucharist a unique sacrifice." By this time the congregational functions of prophecy, priesthood and kingship had been surrendered to the episcopacy and the Church had passed from a democracy to an aristocracy, which in time ended in the papal monarchy.

In his view of the molding influence of the synagogue and the healthen associations on the polity of the Church, Dr. Lindsay is not so radical as Dr. Hatch. He affirms that the internal organization of the Christian communities owed very little to the Jewish synagogal system. Nor does he attribute so much to the imitation of pagan societies organized for the worship of particular deities. We know little about these confraternities, especially in the east. Our information comes from the west and this belongs to the pre-Christian period. "All that can safely be said is that there was a certain external resemblance between the Christian societies and the pagan confraternities, and that it was for the advantage of Christians to make the most of this."

This volume ought to be read by all who have any doubts as to the ecclesiastical authority of their denomination or are casting lingering looks toward the Anglican paradise, that asylum of the distressed, discontented and the ambitious. The day of Romanizing and Episcopalianizing are happily past in our church. If men go into one or the other fold it cannot be because they find in them the Church of the first three centuries. There may be other reasons for a transition, but the Church question of the last generation is dead. There will be no more controversies in any denomination on those issues. The new data that have been brought to light by the discovery of the *Didache*, the new standpoint of scholarship, and the change of emphasis in the interpretation of Christianity have forever settled points around which men waged bitter conflicts. Some old veteran may occasionally get down his rusty flint-lock and imagine he is fighting again the battle of the Civil War. But he will find few of the rising generation lending an ear to his dreams. The study of these lectures will throw light on many interesting questions concerning the early Church, will aid the reader in coming to intelligent conclusions, and will keep him in touch with the latest researches on early Church organization.

G. W. RICHARDS, D.D.

THE MYSTERIES OF MITHRA. By Franz Cumont, Professor in the University of Ghent, Belgium. Translated from the Second Revised French Edition by Thomas J. McCormack, Principal of the La Salle and Peru Township High School. With a Frontispiece, Map, and Fifty Cuts and Illustrations. The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago, Ill. Pages 239.

Professor Harnack, in the first volume of his history of dogma, writes, "in the third century Mithraism was the strongest rival of Christianity. Since the middle of the second century the Fathers considered it a caricature of the Church. The Mithra cult had its redeemer, mediator, hierarchy, offering, baptism and sacred meal. It emphasized the ideas of propitiation, immortality and a savior." Since the Church was brought into such close touch with the Mithræum for about a century, and since on the surface there are so many points of resemblance between Christianity and Mithraism, a work throwing light upon these relations is a desideratum for every student of Church history as well as of ancient religions.

Professor Cumont is the greatest living authority on this subject. This book of 228 pages contains only the "Conclusions," printed at the end of the first volume of a large work on the Inscriptions and Statues of Mithraism, containing 931 pages, 507 illustrations, and a complete descriptive and critical collection of all Mithraic texts, inscriptions, references and monuments that have been recovered from antiquity. We, thus, have in brief and readable form the results of a lifetime of scientific research on Mithraism in its relation to the imperial power of Rome, to the religions of the empire, and the liturgies, doctrines, and customs of the Christian Church. Wissowa, in his "Religion und Kultus der Römer," cites Cumont as his leading authority in the section devoted to the Mithra cult. English readers are, therefore, indebted to Professor McCormack for his excellent translation of a permanent authority on the subject discussed.

The religion of the Magi exercised deep influence on oriental culture at three different periods. Parseeism made a definite impression on Judaism in its formative stage and several of its cardinal doctrines were disseminated by Jewish colonists throughout the entire Mediterranean basin. The second period of influence was when the Romans conquered Asia Minor. Here, from the earliest times, colonies of Babylonian Magi had settled and united their traditions with the doctrines of Greek philosophy. The religion, which was thus elaborated, was a complex product but prevailingly oriental in character. The third period, when Mithraism began to spread and assume alarming proportions over the empire, was in the second and third centuries A. D. Both Christianity and Mithraism came from the East and began their work of missions about the same time. The adversaries were

amazed at the similarities in their respective systems. They could only account for them on the ground that the Spirit of deception had caricatured the sacredness of their religious rites. A map, at the end of the book, shows the extent of the dissemination of the Mithraic mysteries. We find shrines from Scotland to Armenia, and from the banks of the Danube to the Arabian desert. In the third century, when Mithra worship was at its height, it was probably more extensively spread throughout the empire than Christianity. Some one has significantly asked what would have been the fate of the Church had Constantine chosen Mithra instead of Christ for his patron deity on his march to Rome to meet the army of Maxentius? The Christian can easily answer that question; the sceptic may be left to speculate on his supposition.

Our chief concern is with the relations which existed between the Church and the Mithræum. The author devotes very instructive chapters to the Origins of Mithraism; The Dissemination of Mithraism in the Roman Empire; Mithra, and the Imperial Power of Rome; The Doctrine of the Mithraic Mysteries; The Mithraic Liturgy, Clergy and Devotees; Mithraic Art, and finally Mithraism and the Religions of the Empire.

One of the chief causes for the rapid spread of Mithraism during the imperial age was its conformity with the political tendencies of the time. The ancient Roman Republic was gradually transformed into an oriental monarchy. At first the emperor was the representative of the nation, the chief magistrate of Rome. But in the century following Augustus he became the representative of God on earth. He was *dominus ac deus*. The Asiatic cities already erected temples to Augustus and rendered homage to him in a special cult. The orientals always considered their sovereign as King and God. The transfer of the capital to Constantinople, the reign of eastern emperors, and the growth of absolutism united in the apotheosis of the Roman sovereigns. "These religions, i. e., the oriental, propagated in Italy dogmas which tended to raise monarchs above the level of humankind, and if they won the favor of the Cæsars, and particularly of those who aspired to absolute power, it is because they supplied a dogmatic justification of their despotism. In place of the old principle of popular sovereignty was substituted a reasoned faith in supernatural influence." The author shows how Mithraism lent itself to a justification of a *jure divino* Imperialism.

Mithraism was, also, in harmony with the prevailing philosophy of the imperial age. Critical thought explained the sacred traditions and discovered in the popular gods the forces and elements of nature. A predominant place was, accordingly, given to the sun on which the very existence of our globe depended.

The center of worship was the *sol invictus*. Just as in the Roman system the sun was central, so among the Mithraists the royal planet was supposed to hold sway over the other stars. On both sides the occidental and the oriental, the growing tendency was to see in the brilliant star that illuminated the universe the only God, or at least the sensible image of the only God, and to establish in the heavens a monotheism in imitation of the monarchy that ruled on earth. Mithraism thus gathered up and collected around itself the political, philosophic and religious tenets of the Greco-Roman world and tried to establish a universal religion in the worship of the invincible sun.

It is interesting to note the points of resemblance and of difference between Mithraism and Christianity. Their diffusion was equally rapid and extensive. They drew their proselytes mainly from the lower classes of society. They addressed themselves less to scholars than to the masses. They differed, however, in the fields which they occupied. Christianity found its most congenial soil in the countries of the Jewish diaspora, on Mediterranean shores. Mithraism spread through social and political agencies; "namely by the importation of slaves, the transportation of troops and the transfer of public functionaries." It was in government circles and in the army that it counted its greatest number of votaries,—that is, in circles where very few Christians could be found because of their aversion to official paganism. It found its strongest points of support in the Danubian provinces and in Germany whereas Christianity made most rapid progress in Asia Minor and Syria. In the valley of the Rhone, in Africa and in Rome the two religions came into closest contact in the third century, and the battle was fought out between them.

In their respective doctrines and practices there was a striking similarity. The adepts of both formed secret conventicles and called themselves "brothers." Both purified themselves by baptism; received by a species of confirmation the power necessary to combat the spirits of evil; and expected from a Lord's Supper salvation of body and soul. Both held Sunday sacred and celebrated the twenty-fifth of December, the one as the birthday of the sun, the other of the Christ. "They both preached a categorical system of ethics, regarded asceticism as meritorious, and counted among their principal virtues abstinence and continence, renunciation and self-control. They both admitted the existence of Heaven inhabited by beatified ones, and of a Hell peopled by demons, situated in the bowels of the earth. They both placed a flood at the beginning of history; they both assigned as the source of their traditions a primitive revelation; they both, finally believed in the immortality of the soul, in a

last judgment, and in a resurrection of the dead, consequent upon a final conflagration of the universe."

On these points of resemblance the author takes a very conservative position. He does not jump to hasty conclusions. He says: "We are too imperfectly acquainted with the dogmas and liturgies of Roman Mazdaism, as well as with the development of primitive Christianity to say definitely what mutual influences were operative in their simultaneous evolution." He guards the reader from assuming that resemblances are a proof of imitation. "Many correspondences between the Mithraic doctrine and the Catholic faith are explicable by their common oriental origin."

If Christianity and Mithraism offered profound resemblances, the principal of which were the belief in the purification of souls and the hope of a beatific resurrection, differences no less essential separated them. One of these was their relation to the Roman paganism. Mithraism was conciliatory and compromising; Christianity was unrelenting in its antagonism against idolatry. At first such an attitude gave Mithraism the advantage, but in the end Christianity saved itself by its unyielding opposition to pagan rites and superstitions. Mithraism found its last great patron in Julian the Apostate, but, again the Galilean conquered. It survived after the third century in many old Roman families but its fate was sealed the moment the protection of the State was withdrawn from it. Some of its principles have continued in Manicheism which came into the west in the fourth century.

We do not presume to criticise the conclusions of a specialist like Cumont. The facts which he has published are doubtless reliable. The comparisons he makes and inferences he draws are clear and rational. Christianity does not lose by the comparative study of religions. We may find its precepts, its doctrines, its forms of worship in other cults and religions but nowhere do we find its Christ. The glory and power of Christianity are not its polity, cultus, or dogmas but the historic Jesus who is our Lord and God. Here is the secret of the victory of the Church over Mithraism. Mithra was an abstraction of the mind or a mystic fancy, in whom men could not trust, whom they could neither love nor follow. But Jesus is an historic person, who speaks our language and perpetually wins our hearts. Foreign elements may have found their way into the Church of the empire. Greek philosophy, oriental cults, and Roman law doubtless left their impact on the Catholic Church, but the study of Jesus in the New Testament and the obedient following of His word will always enable us to separate the gold of the Gospel from the dross of the empire and preserve for us the life once for all communicated to, and always communicated by, the saints.

G. W. RICHARDS, D.D.

MINUTES AND LETTERS OF THE COETUS OF THE GERMAN REFORMED CONGREGATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA, 1747-1792. Together with Three Preliminary Reports of Rev. John Philip Boehm, 1734-1744. Published by Authority of the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States. Reformed Church Publication Board, Philadelphia, 1903. Pages 463. Price, \$2.50.

This book stands out by itself among the historical publications of the Reformed Church. It differs from the works of Mayer and Harbaugh, Dubbs and Good in being a source for the Church's history and not a history of the Church. In the interest of historical science the Reformed Church could have published no more valuable documents. It will be an indispensable aid to the future writers on the history of the Reformed Church and of the State of Pennsylvania.

The Eastern Synod wisely turned to practical account the suggestion made by Professor Hinke in the historical meeting in Heidelberg Reformed Church, Philadelphia, October 18, 1903. He then proposed that the minutes of the Coetus should be published by the Synod and that the Historical Society should be revived. Both proposals have been carried out. The publication of the Coetal Minutes was made possible only by the labors and generosity of Dr. James I. Good, who has devoted a great part of his active life to gathering historical material relating to the Reformed Church in Europe and America. The story of the discovery of the minutes and letters in Holland he relates in an interesting manner in Part One of the Introduction. Part Two of the Introduction contains a valuable account of "Reformed Archives," where they are located and the documents they include, by Professor Hinke. There are still many important papers in manuscript which should be published in the same manner as the Coetal Minutes. We trust the reception given this volume will encourage Synod in further publications.

The translations, from Latin, German and Dutch originals, were made by Professor Hinke assisted by Dr. Sechler, to whose diligence and painstaking exactness the volume owes not a little in its present form. We consider the work of translating remarkably well done. We do not forget the difficulties which must have confronted the translators in many of the manuscripts. At the end of the book there is an index of persons, places, and subjects. One hundred and twenty-three names of individuals, mostly ministers and elders of the Reformed and neighboring Churches, are mentioned. Two hundred and three places are referred to; congregations and localities mostly in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, New York, and New Jersey. These facts will at once show in how many different ways the book will be used hereafter.

Without attempting to outline the contents of the volume, which has been done in the *Messenger*, I shall simply point to some

of the purposes for which the minutes ought to be procured. The book will have its value for the historian of the United States in studying the very important German element in our nation. It will rank with the *Lutheran Hallesche Nachrichten* in significance for the study of the history of Pennsylvania in the colonial period and that of the German churches in the same period. Many of our oldest Reformed congregations can trace the story of their origin in these Coetal reports. The biographers of ministers and family historians will get light from this source. We shall also be able to understand better the spirit of our church in this country; its early conflicts, its victories and defeats, its friends and foes, its government, doctrines and customs, as we read the letters of Boehm and the annual reports of the Fathers.

From these statements it becomes evident that the book is not simply for specialists in church history or even for Reformed ministers. It will be read with interest by intelligent laymen, and by none more than by those who have already read Dubbs or Good or both on the Reformed Church. It should be placed in Sunday-school and public libraries throughout the State. Historians of other denominations and writers on civil affairs will also give it a hearty welcome.

G. W. RICHARDS, D.D.

BIBLICAL AND LITERARY ESSAYS. By the late A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1902. Pages ix and 320.

Professor A. B. Davidson, author of the essays contained in this volume, was the Nestor of Scottish Biblical scholars in the last generation. A modest man of deep earnest piety, a broad-minded scholar with many rare gifts united with extensive learning, and a successful, inspiring teacher whose personality impressed itself on the minds of those that came within the sphere of his influence, he was a mighty power, spiritual as well as intellectual, for nearly forty years in the lives of young men, many of whom have since become famous for their scholarly attainments and brilliant achievements. We need only name W. Robertson Smith and George Adam Smith. When Scotland entered upon the crisis in Biblical science through which the world is now passing, Dr. Davidson proved himself a judicious instructor. Unlike some of his pupils, he did not rush headlong from the old to the new, but cautiously felt his way, never shutting his eyes against the light, and always advancing as he was assured of the truth. It admits of no doubt that he, in his seemingly timid, quiet way, did more than any other, in safely directing the new and necessary, but perilous movement in his native land. It was said of him that he made the heretics, that is, the higher critics, in Scotland, yet was never himself accused of heresy.

Thanks are due to Dr. Davidson's successor, Professor J. A. Paterson, D.D., that in response to an earnestly expressed hope he has so soon given to the world "some of the treasures which this gifted but modest teacher had, during life, unveiled only to his students." We are glad to learn from the preface that his long-promised and anxiously awaited work on Old Testament Theology will certainly be published as soon as possible, to be followed by another on Old Testament Prophecy, and probably also by a commentary on Isaiah. Meanwhile, we are grateful for this volume of essays, thirteen in number, eight of which now see the light for the first time. The other five will be remembered by readers of *The Expositor*, to which during a period of more than twenty years, Dr. Davidson was a frequent and always welcome contributor. The subjects discussed are various, and display the light extent of the author's studies. Nearly all relate to the Old Testament. The volume opens fitly with his inaugural discourse on "Biblical Theology," delivered in October, 1863, when he began his career as professor in New College. It is followed by an able and important treatise on "The Wisdom of the Hebrews." The next two essays, "The Prophet Hosea," and "The Prophet Amos," show how he was accustomed to deal with the prophetic books, and the three immediately following allow us to see how he viewed the Messianic Psalms II., LXXII. and CX. The next essay, "The English Bible and its Revision," sets forth the principles which should be observed in any revision of the English text, but which unfortunately were not observed as carefully as they ought to have been by the New Testament revisers. The remaining essays are: "Mohammed and Islam," "Arabic Poetry," "Modern Religion and Old Testament Immortality," "The Rationale of a Preacher" and "The Uses of the Old Testament for Edification."

We have given the titles of the essays that the reader may have at least a general survey of the contents of the volume. It would be impossible in a brief book notice to review the several papers singly, because they are too many in number and too varied in character. We can only remark in general that they are always fresh and interesting, and often strikingly original. They never fail to stimulate thought. The arrangement of the essays, if we except the first and the last, is not chronological, because the author's manuscripts are without date. It is fortunate, however, that we know the date of the first and the last. The one is his inaugural with which he began his professorial career in October, 1863; the other is the last introductory lecture he delivered to his students in October, 1899. Between them stretches a wide interval of thirty-six years, during which a man like Dr. Davidson, of a studious mind earnestly searching for the truth, could

not fail to grow in Biblical knowledge, surrendering, reluctantly, it may be, some old cherished views, and advancing to new views of which at the beginning he could not have dreamed, especially as during that long period of more than a generation, there occurred what may well be called a revolution in Old Testament science, in which the Scotch professor could not avoid taking part. In the inaugural we still find him under the influence of Ewald and Oehler; in his latest introductory lectures he has come, it would almost seem unwillingly, under the irresistible spell of Wellhausen. We have found this book a rich source of profit and enjoyment, and heartily commend it to all who are interested in Biblical, especially Old Testament, science.

F. A. GAST, D.D.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. By the Rev. William Turner, S.T.D., Professor of the History of Philosophy in the St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn. Ginn and Company. 12mo, Cloth. Pp. x and 674. List Price, \$2.50.

The appearance of one new book after another on the philosophy of history is an encouraging sign of the times. In modern education interest centers so largely in scientific study that the necessity of searching for fundamental principles is frequently overlooked. It is to be feared that many a student completes a course of study in college or university without even an elementary knowledge of the great questions which have occupied the minds of the greatest thinkers in all ages of the world's history. But, notwithstanding this fact, there is abundant evidence to show that ultimate principles are still the subject of inquiry among thoughtful men, and that the paths over which philosophic thought has traveled are scanned more closely and to better purpose to-day than was generally the case a generation ago.

The new volume published by Ginn & Company differs in two important respects from most of the histories of philosophy before the public. In the first place it does not begin with the philosophic thought of Greece, but pays some attention to oriental or pre-Hellenic philosophy. It is true only 23 pages are devoted to this portion of the subject and the discussion of the oriental systems is perhaps too brief to be fairly intelligible to one who has no previous knowledge of the subject. The departure is, however, in the right direction, and the author is no doubt right in saying that these systems were not without influence on the early speculative thought of Greece, while in the decadence of the Grecian systems certain aspects of oriental speculation made themselves strongly felt. In the second place, the work before us devotes special attention to scholastic philosophy, and gives the systems of the schoolmen with unusual fulness. In fact the author seems to think that philosophy reached its high-water mark in the system of Thomas Aquinas, or St. Thomas of Aquin as he prefers

to call him. The rise and progress of scholasticism are, accordingly, sketched with great minuteness and care, and copious extracts from its leading exponents are given. This makes the book especially valuable as it furnishes the student with a great deal of material not generally accessible. The author's method, as we shall afterwards see, gives us a very good insight into the movement of thought during this period. Perhaps the prominence given to scholasticism throws other important movements somewhat into the shade; but the ability and wide reading of the author in this field serve the student a very good purpose at this point.

In studying the movement of philosophic thought two methods may be pursued, the topical and the biographical. There is an inner connection in the unfolding of thought; there are great questions which press for an answer and which lead the inquirer into regions which must needs be explored. But the answer is not forthcoming at once. At best the result is an approximation to the truth, leading to new inquiries and new solutions. Again there are great thinkers who change the current of speculation and gather around them their devoted followers, men who stand forth as the exponents of the systems which form the landmarks of philosophy. Of course neither method can be used exclusively, but more stress may be laid on the one than on the other. Dr. Turner, of course, names the great questions which come up for solution, and to some extent sketches their progressive development. But his arrangement is largely biographical, showing what each thinker in turn contributed to the elucidation of the problems with which they struggled. His view of the relative importance of different periods and thinkers may appear from the following comparison between the book under review, and Weber's *History of Philosophy*, a book of nearly the same size (630 pp.). Greek Philosophy, Turner, 168 pp.; Weber, 168 pp. Scholastic Philosophy, Turner, 185 pp.; Weber, 56 pp. Modern Philosophy, Turner, 323 pp.; Weber, 301. Turner also gives to Socrates 17 pages, to Plato 29 pp., to Aristotle 34 pp., to Roger Bacon and Albert the Great each 4 pages, to Anselm 7 pp., to Thomas Aquinas 38 pp., to Kant 20 pp., to Hegel 23 pp., to Herbert Spencer 6 pp.

Perhaps the stress laid on the biographical method makes the history somewhat fragmentary. In the case of the Greek philosophers or the Greek schools, such particularization is unavoidable. But when we come to later times, Epicureanism, Stoicism, the problems of Epistemology, the relation between Faith and Reason, between Theology and Philosophy, the problem of Universals, Realism and Nominalism, Empiricism and Idealism, it would seem, might receive fuller treatment by the topical method,

with detailed reference to individual philosophers and their influence in the progressive movements as the various systems unfolded. The plan pursued by the author, however, also has its advantages. In each important case we have first a sketch of the philosopher's life, then a discussion of his philosophy, and finally a statement of his historical position, or of his relation to preceding and subsequent thought in the same field.

The author sees in the rise and progress of scholasticism a historic movement of profound significance. The determination of the relation between faith and knowledge, and the questions to which the problem of universals gave rise, are in his view, of prime importance, and the schoolmen rendered an important service for all time by their discussion of these subjects. "It cannot be denied that some of the problems discussed by the later schoolmen were of a frivolous character; it is, however, a serious mistake to describe the problem of universals as a barren dispute, a controversy about over-refined subtleties. The denial of the universal means sensism, and leads incidentally to the denial of the abstractive power of the human mind. However, the universal has its ethical as well as its psychological aspect, and the denial of the universal means ultimately the destruction of moral ideas and the subversion of the stability of moral principles."*

Anselm recognized the complementary relation of the two formulæ: "*Credo ut intelligam*" and "*Intelligo ut credam*"; and while he did not identify theology and philosophy as Erigena had done, he contended that the two could not contradict each other. It remained for Thomas Aquinas, however, to set the two in the right relation by assigning to each a separate sphere, making the domain of faith distinct from the domain of reason. Theology rests on the authority of revelation; in the other sciences the principal means of arriving at the truth is the use of our own reason and the employment of induction or deduction according to the nature of the science, authority holding a very unimportant place. The whole system of the *Angelic Doctor* is expounded with great force and clearness, and with the evident feeling that the movement of thought away from this position is a wandering in the wilderness from which the giant intellects of modern philosophy have not been able to deliver us. It must be confessed that the system of St. Thomas, as expounded by the author, seems to offer a happy solution to the vexed questions which tried men's souls. But, unfortunately, the answer was not final, and the reconciliation of faith and reason was speculative rather than real. In the progress of scientific and philosophic thought, old questions again raised their heads, and new questions came to the front which made the modern development of philosophy neces-

* Pp. 267-268.

sary. The author thinks that the scholastics who attacked the representatives of the new science were false to the principles of their school, and that much harm came from their antagonism, that Humanism grew out of scholastic soil, and owed more to scholastic vigor and clearness of thinking than we are commonly aware of. We cannot, however, reconcile ourselves to the view that the modern philosophic movement was not necessitated by an internal law of growth and progress which demanded an advance upon the position occupied by Thomas Aquinas. The author regards the development of philosophy as a *process of alternate progress and retrogression*, a rhythmic movement by alternative waves of progress and periods of stagnation or degeneracy. There is one great wave from Thales to Aristotle, and then a vast decline. Then comes the Alexandrian school; then the early Christian era. In the thirteenth century the movement rises to its greatest height, after which conservatism, indifference, and sloth play the part of retrograding forces, until with the opening of the modern era another movement begins. This movement has continued with alternating rise and fall until our own day. It has risen at those points where men like Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Kant and Hegel have appeared; it has fallen whenever adverse influences have predominated; but never has it risen to the altitude attained by that wave of human thought whose crest touched heaven itself, when reason and faith were united in one system of knowledge."*

J. S. STAHR, D.D.

THE CRISES OF THE CHRIST. By G. Campbell Morgan, D.D. With Indexes of Scriptures Referred To; Poetry; Writers Quoted or Referred To; Subjects. New York, Fleming H. Revell Company. Pages 477.

We have in the above-named book a study of the life of Christ in the light of certain marked events in which are revealed in a special degree His personality, His perfection, His mission. The life of Christ is viewed not only as a steady progression like the flow of a river or the growth of a flower, but as marked by sudden flashes of revelation in which what has been going on before is gathered up and expressed in one great fact. The work is not a history, but it presents more of the life of Christ than its title would lead one to expect. Thus the baptism is an act of offering, a sacrifice. Christ needed not to repent yet He places Himself among sinners. The Heavenly Voice announces: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." This Divine approval lets the light fall upon the character of Christ during the years spent at Nazareth. In the light of this event the boyhood and youth of Jesus are reviewed. In the

* Pp. 659-660.

above manner use is made throughout the book of the familiar facts of the Gospels and of the words of Jesus, and He stands out vividly before the mind of the reader. In his study the author makes but little if any use of profane history. The manners and customs, hopes and fears, political history and religious sects of the Jews, such as Edersheim for instance uses to so great advantage in his *Life of Christ*, are here absent. And this is proper. They would be here out of place. The author is entirely scriptural in his treatment of his theme. He is reverent, and well versed in the material he calls to his service from the Old and New Testaments. Here we listen to the prophets, the evangelist, the apostles, and the Lord Himself, and we do not think of the geography or history of the Holy Land. It is the Christ of the universe, not of Judea, the man, not the Jew that we behold. The work is devotional, not critical.

The author begins with the creation of man in the image and likeness of God; considers the fall and its consequences, viz., "Man is distanced from God, because ignorant of Him and unlike Him." This condition of man was the call for Christ. God responds and sends His Son under the compulsion of His love. The capacity for God remained in man, but because of sin he is ever disposed to false views of God. These false views of God are the conscious or unconscious projections of his own personality into immensity. The Redeemer's mission was not only to reveal God and bear the sin of the race, but to manifest true humanity. By humbling Himself to the level of the human capacity to comprehend God, and by presenting the example of perfect humanity, He lifts man himself to a purer manhood by vital union with Himself, and in thus lifting man He elevates the human capacity to know God. Hence the Redeemer comes not only as the word, the eternal Son of God, but as the man. The Incarnation is the fundamental crisis in His life, "All the significance of the crises that follow grows out of this, the first and most marvellous mystery." The restoration of man is by and through the Holy Spirit, man is restored to God by union with Christ; to the knowledge of God by the indwelling of the Spirit; and to likeness to God by sanctification. In this process the activity of the believing subject is emphasized.

In presenting the work of Christ the author selects seven crises in His life—the incarnation, the baptism, the temptation, the transfiguration, the crucifixion, the resurrection, the ascension. It will be readily seen that in the selection of what may be called crises in the life of Christ none of the above could be omitted. They are marked events in the wonderful life, towards which what preceded was progressing and from which the mission of Jesus advanced more rapidly than before they took place.

This is a book "profitable for instruction." The preacher will find it suggestive and helpful in his pulpit labors. We feel as we read it that we are in communion with a reverent and devotional mind and that wherever we should disagree with the author it could be in no other spirit than that of the modesty and love which breathes through the volume. It might be improved by condensation and the omission of superfluous adjectives; but if the task to cut out were given to us we should be loth to begin.

E. N. KREMER, D.D.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE—CATALOGUE OF OFFICERS AND STUDENTS, 1787-1903. *Franklin College, 1787-1853; Marshall College, 1836-1853; Franklin and Marshall College, 1853-1903.* Edited by the Publishing Committee, Samuel H. Ranck, Chairman; Rev. Adam S. Weber, D.D., Rev. Charles W. Levan and President Rev. John S. Stahr, D.D., ex-officio. Published by the Franklin and Marshall College Alumni Association, Lancaster, Pa. Press of Friedenwald Company, Baltimore, Md. Pages 236. Price, \$1.50.

This catalogue was published in connection with the celebration of the Golden Jubilee of Franklin and Marshall College and is a fitting companion to the history of the college, prepared by Dr. Joseph Henry Dubbs, Audenried Professor of History in the college. The character of this book is of course materially different from that of the history, but it is also a history eloquent in names, dates and figures that are essential to a satisfactory understanding of the past as well as present of the college.

The Publishing Committee, of which Mr. Samuel H. Ranck is chairman, has placed the alumni of the college directly, and incidentally all persons who are interested in the institution, in their debt, by the production of this valuable record, which covers more than a century of history. It is the only authoritative work on this subject and stands as a monument to a painstaking effort that has been crowned with remarkable success. The work is well arranged, is replete with facts of great interest, and could only have been brought to such a conclusion under the supervision of one familiar with and trained for such work.

The task the committee has set for itself is to give an account of every person connected with the college for a period of one hundred and sixteen years; to give the names of all the trustees; the graduates and non-graduates; the year and class they entered and the date of leaving; the literary society affiliations; honors at graduation; fraternity affiliations; honorary degrees; present post-office address, or if deceased the time and place of death.

It was possible to do this only to a limited extent in the case of Franklin College. Though it had a separate existence from 1787 to 1853, a period of 66 years, at this remote date not much reliable data can be secured. From all sources the names of only 201 students are given.

The original faculty consisted of five persons, with Rev. Henry Ernest Muhlenberg, D.D., as president.

The records of Marshall College are reasonably complete. During its existence of 17 years, it had in its faculty 27 professors and instructors and 425 students. Of this number 188 were regularly graduated, 42 of whom are still living. The college conferred 56 honorary degrees. The original faculty consisted of three persons, with Dr. Frederick Augustus Rauch as president.

In 1853 Franklin College and Marshall College were united and organized as Franklin and Marshall College. A half century of this union is completed, and during that time 168 men have served on its board of trustees, 61 have been professors and instructors, and 1,750 students have been enrolled, 1,045 of whom have been regularly graduated. Of these graduates 163 have died.

The original faculty consisted of six professors and a tutor. Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, president-elect, and Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, found it impossible to accept the position, and the college was without a president until 1855. Since that date it has had five presidents—Drs. E. V. Gerhart, J. W. Nevin, W. M. Nevin (president pro tem. for one year), T. G. Apple and J. S. Stahr, names revered and cherished not only in the Reformed Church, but throughout educational circles everywhere.

The smallest class consisted of six members and was graduated in 1866; the largest of fifty-nine members and was graduated in 1900.

The class of 1878 consisted of sixteen and is the oldest whose roll is still complete. Of the other classes only those of 88, 90, 96, 97, 01 and 02 have not been invaded by death.

The number of honorary degrees conferred is 212, which does not include those of 1903. Ten degrees have been granted for regular graduate study.

This catalogue also very properly contains the names of those who were connected with the Classical Institution and High School from 1832 to 1836, to the number of 84. This record is a matter of distinctive historic interest.

A list of the names of the graduates of Mercersburg College from 1871 to 1880, to the number of 60, is here recorded, because according to the constitution of the Franklin and Marshall Alumni Association, they are members of said Association.

It includes also a complete list of the officers of the Alumni Association from 1840 to 1902, together with the several district alumni associations, their officers, with dates and places of annual meetings.

It closes with two full indices—a geographical index and a general index of names. The paper and press work are excellent and the proof-reading has been exceptionally well done.

The completeness of this volume makes it of exceeding and permanent value. Here at a glance you may find facts to which we have hitherto not had access. It, therefore, supplies a long-felt want, and is a monument to the industry and skill of the Publishing Committee, and a credit to the college in the interests of which it has been published.

E. R. ESCHBACH, D.D.

HISTORY OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE. *Franklin College, 1787-1853; Marshall College, 1836-1853; Franklin and Marshall College, 1853-1903.* By Joseph Henry Dubbs, D.D., LL.D., Audenried Professor of History and Archaeology in Franklin and Marshall College. Pages 416. Published by the Franklin and Marshall College Alumni Association at Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Press of the New Era Printing Company, Lancaster, Pa. 1903. Price, \$2.50.

The most important as well as the most extensive history of the educational movement of the Reformed Church is the volume under review. The work of the committee is well done. The paper, size of page, letter press, binding and illustrations are all that could be desired in a Jubilee Memorial Volume. It contains nearly a score of interesting autographs, besides an equally large number of illustrations, together with eighteen full-page plates, which add greatly to the beauty and value of the book.

Fourteen pages contain necessary preparatory matter, and at its close several pages are devoted to an interesting bibliography. A full index is added, so as to make the contents readily available.

We especially owe a debt of gratitude to Rev. Dr. Dubbs, who is its author. The scope of the work is well outlined on its title page. While it comprehends a general survey, it traces the successive steps in the development of the history of the college, and shows its present conditions. As the result of long and special study, our author has with a master's hand treated the several phases of our educational experience. Historic personages, with color of local surroundings; the social life with characteristic incidents, together with the several steps in the progress from almost primitive beginnings, are graphically portrayed, while it is illuminated with well-chosen historic pictures and illustrations.

The style is pleasing and attractive. The author has accomplished much in the collection of material, and has used it to the best advantage. The number and variety of facts accumulated by him gave him a choice of material that freed him from the cramping limitations that are often forced upon writers because of insufficient data. The method of arrangement is excellent. While the volume is comprehensive there is shown a fine discriminative selection, so that the reader has placed before him in an attractive manner just those things which the average man wishes to know about the history of the college, much of which he has hitherto not been able to obtain.

The contents of the book are divided into 30 chapters, and under three general heads. The first eleven treat of the history of Franklin College; the next eight of Marshall College, and the remaining eleven of Franklin and Marshall College.

We have here a connected and fairly complete history of Franklin College, which is something we never had before. It covers an interesting period in the colonial condition of Pennsylvania. The reader is confronted with prominent historical personages with just sufficient detail to make their individuality stand out clearly, so that our interest in their benevolent and philanthropic purpose is aroused. Their motive was to make suitable provision to educate the Germans of Pennsylvania. The movement, however, never reached the object at which it aimed. Our author clearly presents the successive stages through which it passed. He faces the facts, tells the story unflinchingly, sometimes pathetically, but always graphically, and in a way to increase our reverence and respect for the effort of those early days and for the heroic men who conducted it. The history reveals the persistent faithfulness of the board of trustees and how they succeeded in accordance with the terms of the charter always to maintain, if not a college, at least an academy, or high school; how carefully they managed its resources, and how loyal they remained to their trust, until relieved by the union that was effected with Marshall College.

The narrative brightens when the author comes to the second division, which relates to the origin and history of Marshall College. Here is life, spirit, action. Franklin College originated in the desire to impart education; Marshall College in the desire to obtain it. The latter had its roots in the conscious need of the people in whose midst it was started. It rather came indirectly and grew out of the effort to conduct a theological seminary. The need of "classical instruction," as a basis for theological studies called into being a classical institute in 1832, which was changed into a high school in 1825, and into Mercersburg College in 1836.

"A great teacher—a powerful and attractive personality," says our author, "was in a certain sense its starting point." That was no doubt true, and it is equally true that the main inspiration of its continued existence was an additional remarkably "powerful and attractive personality." There is given us a graphic picture of the humble circumstances and poverty of the early days of Marshall College. It is the history of a continuous struggle. This indicates the measure of its vitality and power. There is comprehended in it a mine of biographical material that will always be of value. The history of this struggle forms one of the most interesting portions of the book. The author has

ingeniously woven into the narrative a number of seemingly unimportant but highly characteristic incidents, that give spice and an added interest. Some of these have been handed down by tradition from generation to generation, and deserve to be permanently preserved among our records.

The third general division treats of Franklin and Marshall College, which was constituted by the union of Franklin College and Marshall College, on conditions mutually acceptable to both. This, like all true unions, was for the benefit and advantage of both. The two colleges were different from each other, but the one seemed to possess what the other lacked. The one had a remote and honorable origin, was associated with distinguished historic names, had some endowment and was located in an important center of Pennsylvania life. The other had only seventeen years of independent existence, but had inherent life and vigor, the genius for teaching and the desire for learning, but was without endowment.

The successive steps leading up to and resulting in the consummation of this union are forcibly presented. The influential and intelligent activity of distinguished personages, eminent both in church and state, in promoting it and afterwards in conducting the affairs of the college are made to pass before us in review.

The story of the erection of the new college buildings, of the society halls, and of the several individuals who were prominent in the execution of the work, are presented somewhat in detail. The early struggles of the college and of the two literary societies are recited so as to give a charm to the several occurrences. The faculty is made to live again in our presence, not merely by photo and autograph, but by the characteristic traits of each, deftly sketched by a master hand.

We have not the space to give abstracts from the book as it recounts the abilities and virtues of the noble men who presided over the affairs of the college, of the fruitful work that has been done, of the rapid expansion of the institution nor of the many changes and improvements that have taken place. Suffice it to say that on the once barren campus there are now clustered a collection of noble buildings.

If any one would know the history of the college buildings; of the society halls, of the academy, of the observatory, of the gymnasium, of the Watts de Peyster Library and of the new science building; if he would know the interest and liberality of the church to which they belong, he must read this Jubilee Memorial History, which deserves the widest circulation, not only among the friends of the college, but among all persons who are interested in the struggles and successes of a college which stands for broad liberal culture for its own sake; which persists in being

loyal to the cause it represents, and survives not merely because of its fitness to live, but which to-day presents inviting opportunities for faithful and successful effort.

A denominational college is not maintained particularly to promote sound learning, but to train men for good and effective work in the kingdom of God. It must be judged by what it does for its students. Its worth must be measured by the service its graduates render to society and the Church. They are its credentials.

You will find in these pages a history that is unrivalled in its class; you will obtain from its reading much that would be otherwise unattainable, even though you could command the data, without also a mind approximating that of our author, so as to skillfully arrange the perspective, and draw the sketch with a like fineness of literary method. The pleasing style and inherent value of the facts make it not only a readable but an entertaining piece of historical writing that will justly increase the reputation of its author.

E. R. ESCHBACH, D.D.

THE REPRESENTATIVE MEN OF THE BIBLE FROM ISHMAEL TO DANIEL. By George Matheson, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E. New York, A. C. Armstrong and Son. 1903. 5 x 7½ inches. Pages 350.

This is the second instalment in a series of character studies from the pen of this gifted writer. The studies are not historical nor critical. They are simply an analysis of the characters as the Bible paints them, without any reference as to how or when they came. In Dr. Matheson's own words, "I have imagined myself in a studio, looking at the forms delineated, and simply asking the question, What did the artist mean?" Consequently, whether the characters portrayed have an historical basis or are ideal or legendary subjects is not for the author to consider. He simply accepts the characters as he finds them, and in vivid delineation, holds them up for our consideration and edification. He poses neither as an advocate of higher criticism nor of the old orthodoxy, but desires to find ground that is neutral between the two. This common ground he finds in the fact that the figures are here, and that whether they be historical or imaginary, it is through them that the revelation comes.

The characters considered are sixteen in number. The originality of the author is revealed in their designation as well as in their manner of treatment. For example, some of the characters treated are "Ishmael the Outcast," "Lot the Lingerer," "Melchisedek the Uncanonical," "Balaam the Inconsistent," "Mephebosheth the Deformed," "Jonah the Narrow," "Daniel the Daring," etc. The characters, some of them otherwise obscure, are clothed in real flesh and blood, and are made to walk

and talk and act as real men before the mind of the reader. This is the charm of Dr. Matheson as a writer. In imagination he carries himself, and with him his reader, back to the day and place in which his actors lived and moved. There he sees living men, moved and inspired pretty much as the men of to-day are moved and inspired. The result is a reality and a charm which holds the attention of the reader to the end of each chapter.

A brief outline of one of the chapters will indicate the manner of treatment. Take the study of "Aaron the Vacillating." The author divides humanity into three classes, the man of success, the man of failure, and the man of shortcoming. The last is placed between the other two. He is the man who misses the mark by a narrow margin. Such was the lot of Aaron. He was older and more outspoken and more eloquent than Moses. Yet Moses is selected to be the leader in the emancipation of Israel. Why? Because Moses was firm, and Aaron was vacillating. Looking at the two with human eyes, Aaron might seem to be the stronger vessel. Yet God knew him to be the weaker vessel. His yielding to the demand of the multitude for a visible token of the Divine Presence shows his vacillating spirit. His was a golden opportunity—it resulted in a golden calf.

But not all was lost in this act of weakness. Aaron's act showed his evident sympathy for the people and his ability to accommodate himself to the circumstances of the hour. These qualities gave him the power to become the leader of the church, the Jewish priesthood, which is the forerunner of the Christian ministry. Joshua, the leader of the army, might be unbending. But the pastor of the congregation must not be unbending. "He must watch the course of the stream. He must observe the current of the time. He must consider the state of the tide. Aaron was chosen because he was such a man as that. * * * The man who can feel the pulse of the multitude and suit his gospel to their needs is the man who merits the foremost place in the sphere of the pastoral office."

The devotional spirit of the author is revealed in an impassioned prayer with which he closes each chapter. A single example will suffice to show their beauty and their value as models. The prayer to the chapter on "Melchisedek the Uncanonical" is: "I thank Thee, O Father, that Thou hast ever planted thy first rose ere the Canaanite has been expelled. I thank Thee that Thou hast sown the wheat before Thou hast plucked up the tares. I thank Thee that Thou hast set Thy primrose into my early year. There are Melchisedeks in the heart while the heart is still only a 'land of the Canaanites.' My aspirations come sooner than my deeds. Long before I am good I have longings after goodness. Thou *acceptest* me for these longings, O my God! Thou waitest not

for the full corn; Thou tarriest not for the autumn ripeness. Thou comest to the one opening bud in my heart—the one Melchisedek in my Canaan. Thou comest to my first rose—my primrose. * * * And thou hast accepted that solitary flower and called it righteousness. Thou hast beheld my one star and called it Bethlehem. Thou hast seen my one thread of gold and called it Christ. Thou hast heard the faint beating of my heart and called it Calvary. Thou hast received Melchisedek in spite of his environment; in the dark and in the cold Thou hast received him, in the midst of the Canaanites Thou hast received him. Bless the Lord, O my soul”!

These studies would make acceptable topics for the prayer-meeting service. The methods of treatment are excellent models and would be edifying to any congregation.

H. H. RUPP.

THE RELIGIOUS SENSE IN ITS SCIENTIFIC ASPECT. By Greville Macdonald, M.D., New York. A. C. Armstrong and Son. 1903. Pages 242.

The above is the title given to the published lectures delivered by Dr. Macdonald before the students of the several departments at King's College, London, in June, 1902. It is an attempt, and a fairly successful attempt, to trace the evolution of the religious sense in man. The theory of the evolution of the body is practically a closed question. The theory of the evolution of the mind is rapidly gaining its adherents. The theory of the evolution of the soul, as manifesting itself in the religious sense, is still an open question for debate. Whether its origin can be traced to the lower animals, or whether it is a special creation, given only to man, this remains to be determined.

Dr. Macdonald inclines to the former theory, and in these lectures he gives his reasons for his belief. He has no desire to discuss the old classical philosophies, nor the old orthodox dogmas, though they have their value. Rather, he would confine himself to present-day thought, and to scientific facts as we know them. But he does not do this with any utilitarian end in view—the things he would speak about have no practical bearing upon the necessities of life. He is actuated simply by the desire for knowledge, with reference to what he calls “the religious sense.” To one possessing this knowledge there will come greater wisdom, and along with wisdom, greater understanding.

The religious sense the author defines as follows: “The religious sense, whether passive or active, is that acknowledgment of the law which compels all creatures possessing the sense to work or live for objects or attainments, be they immediate or prospective, in which the individual has no personal concern, save perhaps in the exalted specimens of the species man.” From this definition

he excludes, and purposely, any suggestion that the religious sense is identical with the social sense. Why? Because the social sense is utilitarian, altruistic and scientific, but the religious sense is ideal, transcendental and intangible. Therefore, while both senses partake of the ethical, and while the religious sense may be the foundation for the social, yet the two are not one, or identical.

The religious sense may be subdivided into the religion (1) of service, (2) of renunciation, (3) of freedom. The author discusses the religion of service in his first lecture, and shows that the earliest indications of a germinal religion of service is found in a very simple form of life—the sponge. He describes the fresh-water sponge, known as *Spongilla fluviatilis*. It consists of a city built by living things, sponge sarcodes, each of which, while building the wonderful structure and supplying its own needs, shares also the life of its neighbors. Each individual sarcode seems to be inspired to work for the good of the entire community of which it is a part, although it is only immediately and impersonally concerned in the work. Here there is revealed in the sponge the germinal religious sense of service, the embryonic form of what has attained to its fullest development in man. Thus we may speak of the soul of the sponge-sarcode, and see in it the human soul in embryo. With this difference, however: man is self-conscious; therefore, the human soul is free and personal; man's soul is in part his own. But the little soul of the sponge-sarcode is not conscious, is not its own, is not personal; it is only God's.

The second lecture treats of the religion of renunciation. The author finds it manifested alike in the humblest of animal forms and in the most perfect of plant life. After discussing the nature of beauty, which he calls "the light of the law," he describes the common daisy. "The florets of the central disk are independent and self-contained workers in procreation," each fulfilling the law of its being. But the circumferential rays have yielded up their stamens and anthers, and along with them their privileges, their completeness, and their independence. Yet these petals also serve the whole composite. How? By folding over in the night and thus protecting the central disk from the cold and rain; by attracting insects to the flower by day, and thus making possible the fertilization necessary for the propagation of the species. Thus the outer petals do perform a function, and thus lie within the realm of the beautiful. They are beautiful because they serve and are useful. Their renunciation of the procreative organs in order to serve the whole is a germ of the religious sense. It is altruistic, and, though unconscious, it is of God.

In the third lecture the author considers the objections which may be advanced against the theory of the evolution of the religious sense, as we find it in man. These objections are two, (1) that because not all possess it, the sense is not real; (2) that it is merely an artificial product of an artificial environment. The first objection the author meets by saying that the lack of a religious sense in some persons is not real, but only apparent. It may be dormant, but it is nevertheless present. Somewhere, sometime, somehow, it manifests itself even in this life. The second objection the author declares can be advanced only by the foolish and unscientific. All scientists know that environment, while it is a necessary factor in the process of generation, yet it of itself never generates anything: it is simply the soil, whether good or bad, in which things are able to assert their own vitality.

Having met these objections, Dr. Macdonald closes his lectures by discussing the question of freedom. He shows in beautiful and perspicuous language the wisdom and beneficence of God in freeing man from the bondage of necessity, and thus enabling him to work out his own salvation in fear and trembling. This freedom is what differentiates man from the lower animal, and makes him the image of God. The lower animal is to obey its religious sense from necessity. Man is obeying the same religious sense in freedom, out of love to God.

H. H. RUPP.

GETTING ONE'S BEARINGS, *Observations for Direction and Distance.* By Alexander McKenzie, D.D. New York, Fleming H. Revell Company. 1903. Pages 304. Price, \$1.25 net.

This little book purports to be a series of "Talks to College men," although in the introduction the author disclaims the purpose of having written the papers of which it is composed in the interest of any particular class or age. According to the author's definition of youth, which belongs to all men, regardless of age, "who regard their methods as capable of improvement," the book is not even intended solely for young men, according to the general acceptance of that term. But whether written for a particular class and age or not, we can heartily commend the book as well worthy of being read either by college men or those not college-bred, by men young in years, or by men whatever their years, "who have the time, and the will, to do new things; or to do old things in a new way."

The book takes its title from that conception of life which compares it to a voyage. We agree with the writer that this conception is not strictly accurate; that life is not so much like a voyage in which we leave one shore and pass over to another as it is like a building in which the foundation is never abandoned. Still both figures are valid, and they are scriptural, and the

author could, we think, have adhered to the idea contained in the title somewhat more consistently than he has done.

The underlying thought in the book is that God intends that a man's life should be successful, that a man has no right to be a failure in life, and that success will not come of itself, but must be achieved by the persistent efforts of the man himself. He dare not drift. There must be no chance from start to finish. He must start aright, and this starting point is indicated in the first four words of the first chapter of Genesis. Having started aright there must be a distinct purpose to be achieved in life, and that is: To be always and everywhere the gentleman. To accomplish this end a man must take account of all the currents and eddies, social, political and religious, that flow and swirl in the sea of life, and of all the influences and forces that move and urge him on and that shape and mold character.

The author develops his theme in a series of papers on the following topics: The Gentleman, Reason, Imagination, The Calling, Time, Now, Words, Shibboleth, Luck, Success, Friendship, The Citizen, Travel and Religion. They are not all of equal merit. It is sometimes difficult to grasp his meaning on account of his short disconnected sentences. It is possible to be too concise, and the writer has fallen into this fault. In his desire to be epigrammatic, he at times becomes obscure. In his chapter on "Words" he confesses a dislike to the long-involved sentences characteristic of many German writers, but surely the short choppy sentences of which the French are so fond are not much better on an English tongue. With this exception we like the book, and although disposed to differ from the author in some of the positions he assumes, we can still readily recommend it to young and old for its hopeful, manly and religious tone.

THOS. S. LAND.

REX CHRISTUS, *An Outline Study of China*. By Arthur H. Smith. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pages 256. Price, 30 cents. Flexible paper cover.

This is the third of a series of text-books published in the interest of foreign missions under the auspices of the Central Committee on the United Study of Missions which was constituted at the Ecumenical Conference in 1900. The previous volumes of the series are "Via Christi," by Louise Manning Hodgkins, and "Lux Christi, An Outline Study of India," by Caroline Atwater Mason. Both of these volumes have had an extensive sale. The volume by Dr. Smith will not be disappointing to those who are interested in the series. He is perhaps the foremost writer on China, having a wide and rich experience of Chinese life, and having made his subject a life study. China itself is a country of absorbing interest and is to-day beginning

to make its influence felt in the political world as never before. The author does not claim to furnish an exhaustive treatment of his subject. He gives it "in outline and no more." But the outline is exceedingly suggestive. One of the Chinese philosophers has said that if one wishes to know something about China, its past and present, he must read five cart-loads of books; but our author has here compressed into a small volume a great deal of valuable information concerning a great country and a peculiar people.

He has grouped his study under the following chapters: (1) A Self-centered Empire; (2) The Religions of China; (3) The People of China; (4) Christian Missions: Part I., From Earliest Times till near the close of the Nineteenth Century; (5) Christian Missions: Part II., On the Threshold of the Twentieth Century; (6) The Open Door of Opportunity.

Each of the chapters is followed by a list of "Suggested Themes for Study or Discussion," and also by books of reference for a more exhaustive study of the subject.

The appendix to the volume, giving a list of leading missionary periodicals, a list of twenty books, and the statistics of protestant missions in China, makes the work valuable and almost indispensable as a guide book for the study of a great and interesting subject.

C. E. SCHAFFER.

BARON STIEGEL. By Rev. M. H. Stine, Ph.D., author of "A Winter Jaunt Through Historic Lands," etc., published by the Lutheran Publication Society. Price, \$1.25. One of the volumes in "The John Rung Prize Series."

The volume before us is partly historical, including biographical data of Stiegel's career in this country, and partly fiction, for the latter part of his life subsequent to his financial losses and imprisonment at Lancaster. It gives a graphic account of the baron's business career at Philadelphia, as proprietor of a large estate including the earliest iron furnace and foundry in Lancaster County, as founder of Manheim, his marriage and later losses and trials. The peril with this class of writing is the doubt it leaves in the mind of the reader as to what shall be accepted as historical fact and what shall be regarded as the fruit of the author's imagination. The book, however, grows in interest as one peruses its pages, and the Christian character of the baron in his firm allegiance to the faith of his fathers, amid trials, perplexities, losses, privations in the colonial period, is unfolded with skill. If the book is intended only for Lutheran readers, the gratulation because of the baron's refusal to join Count Zinzendorf in the union movement for evangelical work, may be passed as an inordinate denominational bias; but even then to

characterize Zinzendorf's motive as "not the most worthy," and to claim that "the ends of the great Church are best attained" by his own church, is not kind or brotherly. Likewise the transformation of the baron into a zealous preacher after his release from prison (which the preface announces a departure from fact) as if the active ministry was the only field in which a man could serve God acceptably, we do not regard as adding strength to the book. Some of the "preaching" paragraphs are thoughtful and quite apropos, while others are almost provoking, as if the writer could not resist the temptation to stop and preach and moralize. The statement of a fact is often the best sermon. Various minor faults in composition could be pointed out; for instance, a careful writer would avoid the monotonous frequency of using such phrases as "in those days," "in those early days" (we counted ten such repetitions on three or four pages of the second chapter), in describing the customs of primitive colonial life. Withal, we find much good in the book; having evidently been written for family reading, it will afford pleasant and instructive evenings at the fireside. It is worth while to read this sketch of a good man in order to realize that though the investment of a princely fortune may end in financial ruin and absolute failure, yet the investment of personal influence from the wealth of Christian character does not fail of lasting and blessed results. The influence of the Pilgrim Fathers occupied a large place in our American literature, though the part played by the Reformed, Lutheran and Moravian people is seldom recognized by writers of history or fiction; and this work may, therefore, be welcomed as a charming chapter added to our American colonial period, whose travail ended in the birth of our nation. The book is neatly printed and bound, though several illustrations of historic buildings or from old prints would add greatly to its value.

G. A. SCHWEDES.

VOCAL AND LITERARY INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE. By S. S. Curry, Ph.D. New York, The Macmillan Company. 5¼ x 8 inches. Pages 384. Price, \$1.50.

The aim of the author in writing this book is modestly stated in the preface. He desires to assist those who teach the Bible to classes or who interpret it in the pulpit. The author's long experience in this line of work has enabled him to discuss in a thorough and striking manner the chief faults and excellences of public Bible reading.

The four main divisions of the book are the Office, the Problem, the Message, and Preparation and the Service. The Problem, by clearly analyzing the different attitudes of the mind in the prayer, in the sermon, and in the Scripture lesson, not only reveals the true relation of each to the others but also makes plain

what should be the aim and the function of the Bible in public worship. In the words of the author it is to "reflect by the voice to other souls the life of the Divine." To accomplish this, the general nature of vocal expression must be understood by the reader. An appreciation of the value of pause, touch, pitch, inflection and movement must be acquired. These essential elements of expression are seldom mastered by the unaided exertions of even the most diligent student. The author recognizes this fact when he says in the preface: "Vocal expression needs the insight, criticism and personal attention of a teacher. The vocal interpretation of the Bible, which is necessarily subjective, requires such help."

Perhaps Dr. Currie is unduly pessimistic in his opinion of the present status of elocutionary training in theological schools. In times past it may have been possible to find "neglect or perverted notions regarding delivery everywhere prevalent," but it is extremely doubtful if so sweeping a statement is true to-day. As a matter of fact, this reflection upon the judgment of the authorities of the theological schools is undeserved. No sound judgment in regard to the work done in this department can be formed by a "glance over the courses of study." All institutions of this kind that have come under the observation of the writer of this article have made definite provision for the instruction of students in this work; the importance and the practical nature of the work is realized and the best teachers available are selected not "on account of their elocutionary and dramatic attainments in public reading" but because of their success as teachers. Undoubtedly in some instances more time might profitably be devoted to the work. In most cases, however, when insufficient time is allowed it is the result of the assumption that considerable attention has been given to the work in the preceding college course. Indeed, the course given in a theological school should presuppose a preliminary preparation in voice work. No college graduate can be said to be educated, in the best sense of the word, who is not able to voice his own thoughts and to interpret literature in a forcible and elegant manner. Hence, if censure is passed upon modern elocutionary training, let it not be placed exclusively upon the work done in the theological schools, but also upon the high schools and the colleges.

The second division of the book deals with the relation of the message, the literature itself, to vocal expression. "The mode of expression is primarily determined by the spirit that causes it." Accordingly, the author analyzes the contents of the Bible to discover the various spirits manifested. Each of these is defined and illustrated by carefully chosen passages from the text of the Scriptures. Every candid reader will at once be convinced of

the importance and the absolute necessity of this study of the literary forms of the Divine Word.

The third division, the technique, deals with the actions of the mind in thinking and in feeling and with the proper modulations of voice by which thoughts are properly expressed. No mechanical rules are helpful to him who has gained complete mastery over his voice and body. But in the process of gaining this control mechanical exercises may be helpful. The musician is not made mechanical by practicing finger exercises until perfect control of the hands is secured. Still, if either the musician or the speaker fails to cultivate his mental and emotional nature in addition to the purely physical powers, the result in each case is mechanical lifelessness. Give the physical organs used in expression separate training to secure flexibility, if you fear mechanical effects, and, in this way, the body will be able to act as the servant of the mind. The voice will be right if the thought and the emotion are right, provided the voice has been trained so that it is capable of adequately expressing thought. The most difficult work in expression is not to develop strength of voice, but it is to train the emotional nature to respond instantly and vigorously to the images which the trained imagination brings into the mind. Without emotional, intellectual, and spiritual development good Bible reading is impossible.

The fourth division emphasizes the importance of a thorough preparation of the lessons to be read. Much of the poor reading that is heard in our churches to-day is not due to an inability on the part of the preacher to do better but is the result of a false assumption that because he is reasonably familiar with a lesson it needs no preparation. If the author had written only this section it would be a tribute to his perception of the actual needs of the preacher. But the whole book is full of suggestions which can not fail to be helpful to every earnest student who seeks to give adequate vocal expression to the word of God.

J. M. CHAMBERS.

DANIEL ERNST JABLONSKI, EINE PREUSSISCHE HOPFPREDIGER GESTALT IN BERLIN VOR ZWEIHUNDERT JAHREN. Gezeichnet von Dr. Herrmann Dalton. Pages xv + 493. Martin Warneck, Berlin, Prussia, Publisher. 1903.

In the volume here brought to our attention, the eminent Reformed preacher and author, Herrmann Dalton, D.D., formerly of St. Petersburg, now of Berlin, has described a most notable personality who belonged to an interesting period in the early history of Protestant Christianity in Europe. Daniel Ernst Jablonski was born, of Bohemian parentage, December 26, 1660. His father was a minister of the community of the Moravian Brethren—the *Unitas Fratrum*, as it has been called—whose

Protestantism was originally derived from John Huss. Jablonski, being thus descended from a race of pious Christian ancestors, was early destined for the ministry himself in the religious community of his fathers. He was, therefore, educated, as carefully as possible, in the schools of his country, especially at Lisa, and at Frankfurt, on the Ader. In the disturbed condition of the times, however, it was not an easy thing to acquire such an education as was desired for the young man, and as his future calling demanded. Yet, though living in difficult circumstances, often in privation and exile, he nevertheless by the favor of a kind providence, and his own perseverance and energy, managed to prepare himself thoroughly for the difficult and important work to which it was his lot to be devoted in after years. After having appropriated the learning that was to be gotten in his own country at the time, it was his fortune, in his youth, to be enabled to spend some years in England, especially at the University of Oxford, where he came in contact with the most notable scholars of the time, among whom may be mentioned Brian Walton, whose polyglot Bible, in the preparation of which Jablonski probably had some hand, is still an indispensable aid to scholars in the study of the Scriptures. His residence in England was a most happy circumstance favoring the broadest development of theological scholarship and character. Upon his return from England the young scholar was at once drawn into the turbulent stream of Protestant religious life in Prussia and the surrounding countries; where it was his destiny to spend a long and eventful life, and to exercise a mighty influence over the course of religious history.

Jablonski was court preacher in Berlin for 48 years, having previously held the same position at Königsburg, and serving his country and his church in this capacity altogether 58 years, during that difficult period when the electorate of Brandenburg was transformed, under the Hohenzollern princes, into the kingdom of Prussia. He spent 58 years in the Christian ministry, and lived to the advanced age of 81 years. And this long life was full of work and service. He preserved his physical and intellectual powers to the end. He knew no leisure and no *dotage*. He was modest in his bearing, and humble. But his life was an exceedingly influential one; and it was through his influence largely that the Reformed Church came to be the established church in Prussia, enjoying equal rights and privileges with the Lutheran. Jablonski was a scholar of the first order, and an ecclesiastical statesman without any superior. His knowledge of language especially was prodigious. He early published an edition of the Hebrew Bible from manuscripts found in the library of Berlin; under his supervision also was published an edition of the Talmud; besides a great number of other works in different lan-

guages, bearing on various subjects of a religious as well as a political character. Dr. Dalton quotes the tradition as being especially true of Jablonski that evangelical preachers of the time were usually poor in this world's goods, but rich in the possession of children and of books; and as illustrating the latter point he reports that his library contained 5,927 separate works in as many as 13 different languages.

But for a further account of the personality of his subject, and of the rich and varied endowment of the same we must refer our reader's attention to the pages of Dr. Dalton in the volume before us. And these endowments were all dedicated to the service of the church. The Hohenzollern princes were of the Reformed faith; and this faith was closely related to that of the ancient Moravian and Bohemian Brethren; so that it required no sacrifice on the part of the Bohemian to attach himself to the Reformed Church and labor earnestly for her welfare. There was, moreover, great need at the time for a man so highly endowed both intellectually and morally as Jablonski. He possessed, as we have just seen, great learning and a clear mind; but what is of more account even than that, is that he possessed a *great heart* and could feel the depressed condition of his fellow-Christians of the Reformed communion, whose interests he was called to serve in the first pulpit of the land, and indeed to sympathize with the miserable condition of the members of all Christian communions owing to their wicked jealousies, their senseless bickerings, and their heartless quarrelings. Jablonski keenly felt the misery of the wretched conflicts of those who should have been brethren dwelling together in unity and peace in the one house of the Reformation. For what was the difference between Lutherans and Reformed, on account of which they cursed and hated each other like wild beasts? As bearing upon this subject we quote a few sentences here from Dr. Dalton's book. "It was neither on account of justification through faith in Christ alone, nor on account of the other fundamental feature of our common evangelical church, namely, that holy scripture is the sole divine standard of our life of faith, that the two brothers separated; here there prevails between them, from all past time, complete and hearty agreement, what in the course of further development proved to be the point of separation, and what in the days of Jablonski, was diligently put in the foreground of controversy, namely the doctrine of the sacraments and of the election of grace: concerning that there originally prevailed harmony." Dr. Dalton quotes Dörner to prove that Luther was originally as much of a predestinarian as was Calvin, and that on this subject surely the two Reformers were not opposed to each other. Those theologians, accordingly, who in the twentieth century, are bold enough to contend that the predesti-

narianism of the Reformed Church precludes her from the doctrine of justification by faith alone are simply mad; nor is their madness of such sort as results from much learning; it is rather the madness of a mere blind fanaticism, like that which in the days of Jablonski claimed that "the present union-movement with the so-called Reformed Church is directly opposed to every one of the ten commandments, to all the articles of the Apostle's creed, to all the petitions of the Lord's prayer, to the whole doctrine of holy baptism, to the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to the holy communion, and to the whole catechism." This was Lutheran thunder; which was meant to be very terrifying to Reformed people, and which, though distressing enough, seeing that it came from persons who claimed to be Christians, was not as annihilative to the Reformed as it was intended to be.

Jablonski devoted all the energies of his great heart and soul to the advancement of this union-movement; and it is to the history of this movement that Dr. Dalton's book is especially devoted. Those who desire the information which ministers and intelligent members of the Reformed Church need in regard to this history, should study this work of Dr. Dalton's. The aim of Jablonski and of the government under whose protection he exercised his ministry, was to bring about a better understanding between Reformed and Lutheran Christians, primarily in the dominions of Prussia, but then also throughout the world, than had existed before. The miserable strife between the two sides of the German Reformation were highly injurious to both, and benefited no body but the Jesuits, who were engaged in the "counter-reformation"—stirring up the Lutherans against the Reformed and the Reformed against the Lutherans. The result of these wretched Jesuitical machinations was the maxim widely prevalent among the Lutherans: *better a Papist than a Calvinist*. And the consequence of all this was the perversion to Romanism of many of the Lutheran princes and people. Those who want complete information of this counter-reformation should read the pages of Dalton, in which the nature and spirit of the seven-headed beast are portrayed in their true character.

Jablonski devoted himself to the bringing about of a better spirit, and ultimately to the establishment on a liberal basis of a complete union between the Reformed and Lutheran Churches. For a complete realization of this purpose the times were not yet ripe. Not until more than a century later, when in 1817 the Evangelical Church was founded in Prussia, was Jablonski's plan approximately accomplished. But he lived and labored not in vain, though much of his work remained for the time being fruitless. He attracted the attention of theologians like Spener, and of philosophers like Leibnitz; and through their favorable opinion and coöperation his spirit and influence pervaded every circle of

religious society; and in course of time made impossible the reign of that fierce sectarian fanaticism which had prevailed so long. In this regard Jablonski's work was crowned with success. The modern Protestant Church could not now go back to the spirit of the seventeenth century. Except in some few obscure corners the custom of denouncing and cursing as heretics Christian brethren of noble faith and pure life, is dead and can never have any resurrection. So much has been gained by the labor and sacrifice of Jablonski and men of his spirit. But Jablonski had larger views and more extensive plans. He aimed not merely at a union of the Reformed and Lutherans in the German nation, but of all Protestant Christians everywhere. The unbroken union of Roman Catholicism and its overweening power throughout the modern Christian world taught so profound and penetrating a spirit as Jablonski the importance that Protestantism too should be united and should present an unbroken front to its common enemy; and he labored incessantly for the realization of this result. But in this respect he was ahead of the times; he penetrated more profoundly into the spirit of Romanism than even many Protestant theologians do now, who have only honeyed words for their ancient enemy beyond the Alps.

The union which Jablonski proposed was a union of all Protestant Christians. The Church of England especially was proposed to be comprehended as an essential factor in this Christian union. Such a union, however impossible it may appear to us now, did not at all appear extravagant to Jablonski. Some of the difficulties in its way now did not appear as serious then as they do at present. There was, for instance, the question of episcopacy and of apostolic succession. That was not a question which in those days would long have kept Christian brethren apart. Jablonski himself was a Bohemian *bishop* as canonically ordained as any bishop could be. But that was not then a matter that was deemed to be of much importance. The question of cultus was viewed by Jablonski as rather serving to unify than to separate Christian brethren. The liturgy of the Church of England was then regarded by all parties as a good and proper order of worship: and Jablonski hoped that this would become the common order of the united church; and we have before us now a German translation of the "Book of Common Prayer" made in 1704, which no doubt had something to do with this union-movement started by Jablonski and his colaborers. Jablonski had lived in England long enough to have conceived a favorable opinion of the English liturgy. In some respects indeed he valued it more highly than he did the continental liturgies. For instance, he considers as erroneous the wide-spread notion that the *sermon* is the center of gravity in an evangelical act of divine worship which came into

currency through the influence of Luther; and in this respect we suppose that his historian, Dr. Dalton, is of the same opinion.

But it is time to bring this notice to an end. There are still many points to which we would like to call attention. But this paper has already grown beyond the length of a book notice, and we must stop. Besides, the interested reader will want to see this book and read it for himself. The style, we would add, is in the best of German. It is German as it is written now, and the intelligent student of the language will have no difficulty in understanding what is written. We commend the book to those among our readers who can read German.

W. RUPP.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD. March, 1903, Vol. 16, No. 3. Editor-in-Chief, Arthur T. Pierson. Funk & Wagnalls Company, Publishers. Subscription, \$2.50 per year. Single copies, 25 cents.

The *Missionary Review of the World* continues to be the standard periodical on missions in this country and probably in Great Britain. For the student and pastor, who desire to keep in touch with the present missionary movements, it is indispensable. We question whether there is any periodical which furnishes more homiletic material with which to illustrate, enforce and demonstrate the perpetual power of the old gospel than the *Missionary Review*. It deals with concrete results, with actual experiences, and with living apostles. The majority of its articles are a positive apology for the religion of Jesus Christ.

In the number before us we are especially impressed with a frontispiece containing the pictures of 46 Christian men and women who have been saved by means of the Jerry McAuley Mission in Water Street, New York City. They are properly designated as "forty-six living evidences of Christianity, showing the power of God to save confirmed drunkards and criminals and to keep them saved." The comprehensive scope of the Review appears in the diversity of subjects treated in the articles. The Quarries Orphans' Homes in Scotland, the Rescue Work in London Slums, The Challenge of God to the Church, Some Interesting Institutions in India, the Natives of Central Africa, the Foreign Missionary Library, the Menace of Mormonism, and the Tuskegee Institute in South Africa are all discussed in this number. The whole question of salvation in its practical phases is discussed by men and women in active work. Most of the writers come from the field and speak with authority. Let Christians in all denominations read the pages of this *Review* and they will be well informed on the great subject of missions and the progress of God's Kingdom throughout the world.

G. W. R.

HISTORISCHER SCHUL-ATLAS ZUR ALTEN MITTLEREN UND NEUEN GESCHICHTE. In 234 Haupt- und Nebenkarten. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Alfred Baldamus und Ernst Schwabe. Ausgefükt in der Geographischen Anstalt von Velhagen & Klasing in Leipzig. Lemke & Buechner, New York, 1902. Price, \$1.05.

A teacher of history is frequently asked to recommend a reliable historical atlas which may be procured at a reasonable cost. There are a number of biblical atlases published in this country. The leading historical atlases, covering the ancient and modern periods, come from Germany. Most of them have the explanatory notes in the German language, while the names of the countries in the ancient and medieval periods are in the Latin, and in the modern period in the German. In this form Putzger's *Historischer Schul-Atlas* may be obtained from Lemke and Buechner, New York. The English student can use it without much trouble. All students will find it one of the cheapest, most reliable, and handiest atlases in the market. It contains 40 maps, with almost 200 subsidiary maps; all of which are so arranged by the use of colors and notes as to demonstrate the historical movements of a particular period. The maps of all countries mentioned in ancient history appear in succession, after them the countries of medieval and modern history. A study of a map may bring the background of history into clearer view than the reading of a volume. No student of history can do any satisfactory work without the constant use of an atlas. We consider Putzger's one of the most satisfactory, for the price, we have consulted.

G. W. R.